



S. Mintz

Reflections on Caribbean peasantries

In: New West Indian Guide/ Nieuwe West-Indische Gids 57 (1983), no: 1/2, Leiden, 1-17

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

SIDNEY W. MINTZ

REFLECTIONS ON CARIBBEAN PEASANTRIES¹

Consisting of perhaps fifty separate countries and territories, most of them insular but not all; the oldest colonial sphere in the European world outside Europe, conquered, settled and "developed" by a dozen different powers — the Caribbean region discourages ambitious attempts at comparison. Not surprisingly the application of the concept of the peasantry to the Caribbean region has so far been rather limited in character. The peasantry is not an old-fashioned subject of study for anthropologists; in the Caribbean region, it is a relatively new concern. Before World War II, and even for a few years afterward, American anthropological interest there was confined mainly to folklore and to the Afro-American tradition, exemplified by the work of such scholars as Melville and Frances Herskovits (e.g. 1936), Martha Beckwith (e.g. 1924), and Manuel Andrade (e.g. 1930). Beckwith also produced both an interesting monograph on Jamaican village life, which was the first of its kind (1929), and a short and important study of ethnobotany in that country (1928). But her pioneering work was for long not imitated.

On the British side there was little of interest to Caribbean anthropologists before the War. Afterward, and parallel to the North American unconcern with the peasantry, there was on the British side an almost obsessive interest in social organization, particularly in forms of union, the family and the domestic group, probably best exemplified by the work of Raymond T. Smith in then-British Guiana (1956), and the monographs by Michael G. Smith (e.g. 1962), Edith Clarke (1957) and others. The first substantial monograph on a Caribbean peasantry by an anthro-

pologist was probably Eric Wolf's study of San José (Ciales), Puerto Rico, which first appeared as a dissertation in 1951, and later formed part of the volume edited by Julian H. Steward and his co-workers, entitled *The People of Puerto Rico* (1956).

Yet we can easily find earlier, and important, non-anthropological contributions. In a volume published by the Brookings Institution in Washington D.C. nearly a decade before World War II, José C. Rosario offered an interesting series of observations on the Puerto Rican *jíbaro*, or highlander (Rosario 1930). For long the epitome of the supposedly canny countryman, who needed neither medicine, since he had leaves to boil, nor food, since he was hardened and cunning, the idealization of the *jíbaro* provides a good example of how honest sociology can succumb to ideological manipulation. Rosario's article rises above the romanticized vision of the *jíbaro* of the nineteenth century, and does so in an almost ignored and unknown work, published nearly half a century ago.

Again, in the case of Jamaica, it is striking to read the articles by Hugh Paget (n.d.) and Amy Lopez (1948) written just after the War. Both authors dealt with the emergence of a Jamaican peasantry out of slavery, long before this development had captured the imagination of any anthropologist. But even more important was the work of Sydney Haldane, Lord Olivier. In *Jamaica the Blessed Island* (1936) this Fabian Socialist, a governor of Jamaica, devotes an entire chapter entitled "The Unforeseen Sequels to Emancipation" to the peasantry of Jamaica, and uses the word "peasant" to describe the freedmen who had gained access to land there. During the postwar period, however, most anthropologists with any interest at all in the anglophone Caribbean were busily debating whether "matripotestal" was a more accurate term than "matricentric" or "matrifocal", and whether "faithful concubinage" described a stage in a developmental cycle or was simply part of some penchant for terminology. These same scholars were not even discussing the possible utility of history for the study of Caribbean peoples. Since they were being studied by anthropologists, since anthropologists only study primitives, and since primitive people — as we all know — have no history, the question seems not even to have arisen (though cf. Mintz, 1953, 1975).

In other words, interest in the Caribbean peasantry was late in coming amongst anthropologists, and was never broadly comparative. In spite of individual scholars like the geographer J. B. Delawarde in the case of Martinique, the sociologist J. C. Rosario in the case of Puerto Rico, and local historians of top quality like Ansell Hart and H. P. Jacobs in the case of Jamaica, there is visible before the 1950's no social science concentration on the rise of Caribbean rural sectors.²

The reluctance of North American anthropologists to study Caribbean peasants was compounded by several different factors. First of all, the Caribbean was simply not considered properly anthropological, for its peoples were merely poor, instead of being primitive. But beyond this, North Americans have never been very comfortable with the word, let alone the concept, of, "peasant." There were no peasants in the United States, and never had been; the lack of a feudal past heavily colored North American attitudes, this one among others. A conception of the peasantry only finally began to sink in during the '60s, when rural convulsions in much of the world (including those addressed by North American adventures in Southeast Asia) were taking their effect. The idea was eagerly seized upon by a wide variety of policy and behavioral scientists, who apparently took it to mean angry bumpkins carrying machetes. Suddenly, everything rural was viewed as a source of peasant unrest. As a result, it may require decades to disaggregate seriously the social composition of the world's countrysides, and to begin to make new sense of their character.

In a thoughtful article in the *American Ethnologist* (1979), Marilyn Silverman has suggested why the peasantry as an analytical category has been little used by Caribbean anthropologists. Quite accurately, she stresses the tendency to see the peasantry as merely a facet of the plantation system. Citing the British West Indian economists Girvan, Best and Beckford in particular, she sums it up this way:

Briefly, historical developments in agriculture, always based on plantation organization, are said to have led to the incorporation of West Indian economies as the bottom level in vertically multinational corporations. The effect is a 'dynamic equilibrium of underdevelopment,' due to the misal-

location of resources within the society, because vertical integration prevents lateral linkages between the productive potential of plantation agriculture and the local economy (Silverman 1979: 467).

"The duality of the agriculture sector presented by the economists," Silverman adds, "is not untrue, it is simply not sufficient" (*ibid.*). The counterposition of plantations, commonly tied to large international corporations, and the peasantry, busily seeking to strengthen its hold on land and affiliate resources, is a useful exercise. I have often referred to this duality in my own work, and labeled Caribbean peasancies "reconstituted" (Mintz 1961); they developed in many cases alongside the lowland plantations and represented "a reaction to the plantation economy, a negative reflex to enslavement, mass production, monocrop dependence and metropolitan control" (Mintz 1964a: xx). Not surprisingly, the peasant's orientation was antagonistic to the plantation rationale; but "such peasants often continue to work part-time on plantations for wages" (*ibid.*). This duality, then, is not a simple one of two distinct unrelated sectors (after the manner of Boeke 1953, and his "dual economy"); instead it implicates developmentally those sectors with each other.

"To the economist," writes Silverman, "the peasant never succeeded, as evidenced in the continuing control by corporate interests and in the lack of input into economic growth that such a sector has made and can make" (*ibid.*). But if we acknowledge that the peasant struggle in at least some Caribbean societies has had real effects on the national social and economic structure, then a strictly dual approach will fail to explain the countryside. Trying to say it more clearly, I wrote that:

A peasant-like adaptation outside the plantation system . . . usually involved a total escape from the system itself — by self-imposed isolation . . . or else a permanently unbalanced oscillation between plantation or other outside labor and subsistence-producing cultivation, as in the case of many or most non-plantation rural settlements" (Mintz 1973: 100).

Says Silverman, at the microlevel (that is of villages, neighborhoods, districts in the country, etc.), "the issue is not the success or failure of the so-called peasantry, but the interaction between the

forces promoting dependency and the peasant struggle" (*ibid.*). It seems likely that "struggle" here is not meant in an explicitly or exclusively political sense. Silverman goes on to criticize (from the point of view of her own interest in linkages between local peasant adaptations and wider national issues) the concentration on plural society theory (as represented by Michael G. Smith), social organization (as in the work of Raymond T. Smith), and stratification as an aspect of ethnicity (as in the work of Leo Despres) — concerns which have attracted so many anthropologists of the Caribbean region. While emphasizing the limitations of such approaches, Silverman is also invoking a justifiable emphasis on class — which for the most part, has entered relatively little into Caribbean peasant studies. In different peasant societies, in the Caribbean and elsewhere, one faces the problem of societies with different "mixes," so to speak, in terms of the internal structure of the peasant sector: the relationships of those inside subsectors to each other; and of such sectors to other nonpeasant groupings. These groups arise out of prior social and economic arrangements: they fit with the rise and decline of other rural sectors; they do not exist in isolation, nor rise and fall in isolation.

One way of looking at Caribbean peasantries is in terms of their slavery antecedents, even though each historical case is understandably different — sometimes very different — from every other. Peasantries arose, became stabilized and consolidated (sometimes on what soon turned out to be a rapidly declining resource base, however) as slavery came to an end, either by emancipation or by revolution, in one Caribbean society after another. In most cases, this process was paralleled by others of a different sort, designed to increase the supply of labor power available to the planters. The reduction of economic alternatives available to the already existing labor supply on the one hand, and the mechanical increase of the supply (by immigration, so-called vagrancy legislation, etc.) on the other, were the axes of Caribbean plantation discipline after slavery and the apprenticeship. The post-slavery period was generally one of intensified competition on the world sugar market. In the long term, the victors of the competition would be planter groups that successfully underwrote and incorporated large-scale technical improve-

ments. On the level of the individual colony and in the short term, planters were more united in controlling the labor supply. But they were also in some competition locally with each other *for it*.

To increase our understanding of post-slavery peasantries in the region, we may have to deal with two intersecting and chronologically overlapping processes, while taking for granted that local planter groups were internally differentiated. One process was the struggle to contain and to supplement the labor power of the "potential" peasantry. The other was the move toward technical improvement, based on scientific achievement and the availability of intensified capital inputs. The two processes may have occurred as between, say, big planters and small, or old planters and new; they may have revealed themselves in one region of a colony (for instance, the Puerto Rican south coast or Oriente Province, Cuba, in the 1880's), or in the whole colony; as between planters in one colony (Barbados) and another (Jamaica) of the same power; as between one planter group (English) and another (Spanish or French); or even as between the Caribbean region and other regions.

At each such level of competition, the relevant forces were somewhat different; at each level, the relationship between local productive arrangements and the world economy is exactly what needs to be exposed and analyzed. From the wider perspective, one sees a long-term technical progression away from dependence upon labor-intensive production — a kind of worldwide technical evolution of industrial agriculture. Yet more narrowly one sees local, shorter-term struggles to avoid the capital commitment required by technical improvement, and to maintain cheap, labor-intensive production.

Labor and capital, then, are counterposed upon a canvas where the availability of land, the guarantees of the market, and the politics of support for planter objectives are to some extent a function of the homogeneity of the planter class, and of its collective strength *vis-à-vis* other capitalist groups in the metropolis. One would want ultimately to take account of the land/labor ratio, as that might be determined in any particular case and at any particular point in time; of the readiness or reluctance to invest, on the part of metropolitan sources of capital (which would

depend on calculations both about imperial resoluteness and the breadth of the market, real or potential); and, of course, of the possible sources and magnitudes of outside and inside labor power. Over time, the struggle for labor on an international scale was superseded by the struggle for capital on a national scale; the planter-capitalist groups with access to sufficient capital for technical advance would withstand better the decline of slavery and the growing apparent "scarcity" of labor.

This abstract and even somewhat imaginary scenario (which first appeared as an introduction to a discussion of the rise of the peasantry in six Caribbean cases; see Mintz 1979), is of course concerned primarily with the plantation. But it would be mistaken to infer that the peasantries of the region were distinct from that system, or merely dependent segments of it. It is exactly because peasantries and other adaptations *co-exist* in dynamic interaction that these variant forms must be taken into account, and a dualistic approach ruled out.

In each locale and in each period, the plantation system had to deal with the presence, the character, and the availability of labor — labor often embedded in a peasant labor process. Hence the peasant and plantation sectors are not two separate and parallel adaptations, but are linked dialectically; and the opportunities for the expansion of the plantation sector are actually affected by peasant successes, the management of family labor, and other factors lying partially outside plantation control. It is this interdependence, and the capacity of the peasant sector not only to respond to initiatives from outside, but also to limit those initiatives, that has to be kept in mind, and any definition of the peasantry must be weighed against these assertions.

In an earlier attempt to explore this ground (Mintz 1973), I had in mind something like the following: a class (or classes) of rural landowners producing a large part of the products they consume, but also selling to (and buying from) wider markets; and dependent upon, and subject to, wider political and economic spheres of control. Caribbean peasantries are, in this view, "re-constituted" peasantries (Mintz 1961), having begun as other than peasants — in slavery, as deserters or runaways, as plantation laborers, or whatever — and becoming peasants in some kind

of resistant response to an externally imposed regimen. Caribbean peasantries thus represent a mode of response to the plantation system and its connotations, and a mode of resistance to externally imposed styles of life. That mode of resistance, however, exists on the ground: real, live persons, coping with genuine constraints. It is on that microsystemic level that we may be able to derive some better understanding of how the local character of peasant life may affect wider adaptive issues.

Anyone who approaches seriously the study of Caribbean rural forms, and especially the rural life of people who produce some part of their subsistence, will be struck by the patterning and integration of the agriculture and the cuisine, and the bright light it casts upon the Caribbean past. This reveals itself in cultivation methods, in horticultural implements, in domesticated plants and animals, in cooking methods and dishes, in lexicon and otherwise. Here are just a few instances. The aboriginal people of the Greater Antilles — those who were horticultural — cultivated manioc (*Manihot esculenta*) and sweet potatoes (*Ipomoea batatas*), numerous other “root” crops, beans (probably *Phaseolus lunatus* and *P. vulgaris*), maize (*Zea mays*) and a squash or pumpkin (perhaps *Cucurbita moschata*). One or more species of red pepper (*Capsicum frutescens* and/or *C. annuum*) were also cultivated; and perhaps it needs saying again that there was no red pepper in the Old World — neither in Africa east or west, nor in the Mediterranean Basin, nor in the Middle East, India or Asia — before Columbus (Sturtevant 1961, 1969). Their fruits included the mamey (*Mammea americana*), the jagua or genip (*Genipa americana*), the soursop (*Annona muricata*) and (at least in Jamaica) the pineapple (*Ananas comosus*). They also had the domestic guinea pig (*Cavia* sp.), and hunted the iguana (*Iguana iguana*), and hutía (*Capromys brachyurus*) and other rodents. The guinea pig, the hutía, and even the iguana have disappeared; but all of the horticultural items, and many more from the pre-Columbian past, are still cultivated and eaten.

To these have been added items such as the papaya (*Carica papaya*) from the American mainland, arrowroot (*Maranta arundinacea*) from Dominica (by way of Barbados; cf. Sturtevant 1969), and other New World cultigens like the tomato and potato. But some of the most interesting additions have come from Africa,

such as watermelon (*Citrullus vulgaris*), okra (*Hibiscus esculenta*), and the so-called "great" millet (actually a sorghum, *Andropogon sorghum*) and pearl millet (*Pennisetum spicata*). In fact, some of the most important weeds in the Caribbean region are also African in origin! (Street 1960). From Oceania and Southeast Asia came rice, chickens, mangoes, coconuts, bananas, the sago palm, bamboo and breadfruit. From Europe there came most "fresh" vegetables (though of course not the tomato) and most domestic animals, though these mainly originated elsewhere and were diffused subsequently to Europe.

All of these domesticates — and of course there are scores more — have been interwoven into specific agricultural and culinary complexes in particular locales, and their study can be historically rewarding (cf., for instance, Sturtevant 1969, on the pre-Columbian and post-Columbian uses of processed root foods, and Handler 1971 on a cognate theme). There may be some items that are mutually supportive, and appear to cluster together in Caribbean horticultural practice. In his brilliant little book *Plants, Man and Life*, Edgar Anderson (1952) describes a Guatemalan garden which is based, he says, on the "dump heap" principle. Because the items in it are mutually supportive physically, chemically, and mechanically (providing each other with needed nutrients, support and shade, and utilizing all of the earth's potentialities, both subsurface and at different heights above it), Anderson argues that this land use is more efficient than the clean tillage more characteristic of western agriculture. And in two interesting papers Carl Sauer (1954, 1981) has explained the multistoried efficiency of this *conuco* horticulture. From manioc, taro, yautía, yams and sweet potatoes below the surface; upward to surface creepers including pumpkin, watermelon or squash (particularly the unusual Caribbean squash, *Sechium edule*, known as *mirliton* in Haiti, *chocho* in Jamaica, *christophine* in the French Antilles, and *chayote* in the Spanish Antilles); upward to tobacco, tomatoes, many sorts of peas (beans), and through millet, sorghum and maize; and ending uppermost in coffee, shade trees, fruit trees, trees providing craft materials, palms and cover — the system tends to support itself.

This is emphatically not to say that it does so without immense

imputs of human labor. But such intercropping helps to insure a continuous (even if often feeble) trickle of edibles to the house, and of craft materials in season, while maximizing land use and the maintenance of the topography. Though such horticulture has been often damned as destructive (and though it often is), a good deal of destruction is the consequence of engrossment of more favorable areas by estate agriculture, so that horticultural techniques have been confined to less favorable land, where severe and erosive runoffs are more difficult to avoid, and more costly in labor.

As with most of the rest of the rural world, the cuisine in the Caribbean region is built around one or several central complex starches, such as maize, millet, manioc or sweet potatoes, with a fringe of seasonings, flavors and contrasts. But in the Caribbean there has been a fairly continuous movement toward the consumption of imports, especially rice, in place of other starches traditionally associated with poverty and a bitter past. In Puerto Rico, rice has almost completely supplanted the more traditional cornmeal and mashed plantain; in Jamaica, rice has similarly displaced cornmeal; and even in Haiti, rice is preferred to cornmeal or "millet" (*pitimi*) and eaten in their place where it can be afforded. These parallel polarities between a preferred item, usually imported and more expensive, and cheaper, more traditional, locally-produced foods stand for parallels in social aspiration, as well.

Indeed, one feature that may make all Caribbean peasantries somewhat contrastive with peasants elsewhere is their deep and ancient involvements in wider circuits of trade, expressed both in consumption and in terms of sources of cash via wage labor. The Caribbean peasant adaptation is actually able to survive only because of labor outputs on land other than its own; but that is not true for all Caribbean peasants. The peasantry in any particular Caribbean society cannot be considered homogeneous. Moreover, while a good deal of the labor output of peasants is absorbed off the farm, less may be sold to other peasants than is sold to estates — or to the state, in some instances. Because of this complexity of resource use (especially labor), peasantries cannot be studied in isolation. Some understanding of the whole class structure of the societies within which they nest seems essential.

Just as the crop repertory of Caribbean peasantries reveals on decomposition the unusual history of the region and its peoples, so any other major aspect of rural life there manifests similar complexity. But particular local adaptations involve solid knowledge of rainfall, soil types, plant characteristics, and the market, as well as estimates of available labor power within the effective kin unit. Peasant productivity is usually heavily taxed by the society, in both visible and hidden ways, and both by the state and its mercantile classes. Internal market systems, which function in varying degree in most Caribbean societies, provide an arena of conflicting class interests, mediated in large measure through a price system. Elsewhere I have argued that the internal market system may be used by the peasantry as a form of defense (e.g. Mintz 1959, 1960); but of course it can also serve other classes and groups as a means for excavating peasant surpluses. These processes, however, are enacted and ongoing, and deserve to be studied — not consigned to some limbo by assumptions about peasant helplessness or unresponsiveness.

The undiminished relevance of the peasantry in our understanding of contemporary Caribbean societies may sometimes be overlooked. An example or two may serve to justify this assertion. Anyone familiar with Caribbean marketing, which is principally done by women, knows that such persons have low social status relative to the insular bourgeoisie, yet retain substantial autonomy in their own lives. Such women often enjoy complete economic independence; hence they and their spouses may participate in quite separate risk structures (e.g. Mintz 1964). In contrast to the image of the peasant family under the domination of the father, some Caribbean peasant kin groups reveal considerable give and take in their division of familial authority. Moreover — and contrary to western stereotypes of our superior evaluation of the individual — traditional West African trading societies such as the Hausa and the Ashanti, and traditional peasant societies in the Caribbean, often provided more opportunity for independent economic activity by women than has the West (Mintz 1971). Indeed, the so-called "westernization" in some sectors of indigenous non-western societies has often meant a decrease in *female* autonomy. This is not, in fact, paradoxical, since

the economic subjection of women in the course of European history is a familiar theme. The readiness of the West to impose its own backwardness upon others and to call it progress is an enthusiasm of tragically long standing.

In the light of these assertions, understanding the rural sectors of Caribbean societies requires serious knowledge of male and female roles and of the sexual division of economic activities among peasantries, and clear distinctions between economic and cultural forces. If one were to compare Puerto Rican, Jamaican and Haitian peasantries in these regards, one would discover immediately the absence of parallels along any purely economic lines. In other words, cultural factors intervene powerfully in the working out of economic arrangements, and it would be misleading to assume that similar economic forces must produce homologous social results under different historical conditions (Mintz 1981).

An example from the past is of a very different order, but may serve again to underline the relevance of the peasantry to our understanding of contemporary Caribbean society. Our recognition of the nature of the peasant sector in the contemporary Caribbean often rests, as it should, upon some historical sense of the region, and of the lengthy processes by which its societies assumed their characteristic shape. In contrasting the pasts of the hispanophone societies — Puerto Rico, Cuba and the Dominican Republic — with, say, the anglophone islands, one grasps immediately that the swift initiation of the plantation economy on a grand scale in the British cases was a historical watershed. In the hispanophone islands, a very early stage of plantation development withered because of metropolitan unresponsiveness, which doubtless had to do with the relatively low level of capitalist development in Spain itself.

But whereas British development led rapidly to demographic africanization of the plantation system, the hispanophone islands accumulated large creole populations whose antecedents, both culturally and physically, were more mixed. By the time the so-called “sugar revolution” reached Cuba in the 1760s, and Puerto Rico in the 1810s (but only very tardily in Santo Domingo), the influxes of enslaved Africans in those cases were counterbalanced

by the presence of large, creolized populations. Accordingly, emancipation in each instance necessarily involved questions of preexisting local adaptations. In the anglophone islands generally, we commonly associate peasantries with persons who are physically at the darker end of the scale. But if we look at the hispanophone islands, we discover that the newly freed did not move easily or commonly into a peasant adaptation. The most dramatic instance is that of Cuba, where a black peasantry never really coalesced (Scott 1982). This appears to have paralleled what had happened in Puerto Rico somewhat earlier, and — though it is less significant — what would eventually happen in Santo Domingo as well.

It is in the light of this contrast that we are in a position to ask certain questions of a historical sort concerning the peasantry. What is the significance, for the economic and social development of these societies, of the absence of a numerous class of black small-scale cultivators in the hispanophone rural sectors? Or to put it differently, what is the political meaning of the fact that the peasants in these agrarian societies are prevailingly white as are their ruling groups, even though large segments of their national populations are nonwhite? Such questions may seem coincidental or, at best, "racial." They are, however, political, because they have to do with opportunities for representation of the needs and stakes of the rural sectors in the political process.

These materials are meant only to highlight by example the continuing importance of peasant adaptations in the Caribbean economies, and of the peasant sectors in the social, political and economic life of Caribbean societies. Even while retaining the contrast between plantation and peasantry on a general and a typological level — for it surely has both heuristic and some analytical value — one must guard against surrendering anthropological common sense, which underlines the need to see how people "on the ground" earn their livings, work out their daily associations, and deal with their problems. What may seem like minor details to the economist or political scientist — the character of the soil and rainfall, the crops traditionally cultivated, the organization of effort within the family, etc. — actually constitute the raw materials out of which adaptive peasant microsystems are

fashioned. Building up and out from these adaptations, rather than generalizing about them — rather than seeing them as residual and defensive, mere downward derivations from the crushing weight of the plantation — we will be able to raise significant questions about how such microsystems differ from region to region; how they are geared in, in each case, with the national society; and how particular peasantries — Jamaican, say, or Cuban — differ from those others with which they also share so much.

In the flurry of activity created among Caribbean intellectuals by dependency theory, the plantation system appears to have won a victory among the theorists that it has not yet quite succeeded in winning on the ground among the peasants themselves. The peasants are still there, many of them. They need to be heard, quite without romanticism or what might be called anti-plantation ideological animism. What is more, their case needs to be understood and, where necessary, defended.

NOTES

1. This paper was originally presented at the Department of American Studies, University of Warwick, as well as at the 1982 Annual Meetings of the Society of Caribbean Studies. I wish to thank Professor J. A. G. Hennessy, of the University of Warwick, who arranged for my visit to the United Kingdom; and Dr. Elizabeth Thomas-Hope, the Society's President, who invited me to speak at the Annual Meetings.
2. I have dealt with some of this background from a North American perspective in Mintz, 1977.

REFERENCES

- ANDERSON, EDGAR, 1952. *Plants, man and life*. New York, Little Brown.
- ANDRADE, MANUEL, 1930. *Folk-lore from the Dominican Republic*. Memoirs of the American Folk-Lore Society, 23. New York, G. E. Stechert.
- BECKWITH, MARTHA, 1924. *Notes on Jamaican ethnobotany*. Poughkeepsie, New York, Vassar.
- 1928. *Jamaican folk-lore*. Memoirs of the American Folk-Lore Society, 21. New York, G. E. Stechert.
- 1929. *Black roadways*. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press.
- BOEKE, J. H., 1953. *Economics and economic policy of dual societies*. New York, Institute of Pacific Relations.
- CLARKE, EDITH, 1957. *My mother who fathered me*. London, George Allen and Unwin.
- HANDLER, JEROME, 1971. The history of arrowroot and the origin of peasantries. *Journal of Caribbean History* 2: 43–67.
- HERSKOVITS, MELVILLE J. & HERSKOVITS, FRANCES S., 1936. *Suriname folklore*. Columbia Contributions to Anthropology, 27, New York, Columbia University Press.
- LÓPEZ, AMY, 1948. Land and labour to 1800. *Jamaican Historical Review* 1: 289–301.
- MINTZ, SIDNEY, 1953. The culture-history of a Puerto Rican sugar-cane plantation, 1876–1949. *Hispanic American Historical Review* 33(2): 224–251.
- 1959. Internal market systems as mechanisms of social articulation. *Proceedings of the Annual Spring Meetings*, American Ethnological Society: 20–30.
- 1960. Peasant markets. *Scientific American* 203(2): 112–118, 120, 122.
- 1961. The question of Caribbean peasantries: a comment. *Caribbean Studies* 1(3): 31–34.
- 1964. The employment of capital by Haitian market women. In R. Firth & B. Yamey (eds.), *Capital, saving and credit in peasant societies*. London, George Allen and Unwin, p. 256–286.
- 1964a. Foreword to Ramiro Guerra y Sánchez, *Sugar and society in the Caribbean*. New Haven, Yale University Press, p. xi–xliv.
- 1971. Men, women and trade. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 13(2): 247–269.

- 1973. A note on the definition of the peasantry. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 1(1): 91-106.
- 1975. History and anthropology: a brief reprise. In E. Genovese & S. Engerman (eds.), *Race and slavery in the Western Hemisphere: Quantitative studies*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, p. 477-494.
- 1977. North American anthropological contributions to Caribbean studies. *Boletín de Estudios Latinoamericanos y del Caribe* 22: 68-82.
- 1979. Slavery and the rise of peasantry. *Historical Reflections* 6(1): 215-242.
- 1981. Economic role and cultural tradition. In F. C. Steady (ed.), *The Black woman cross-culturally*. Boston, Schenkman, p. 513-534.
- OLIVIER, SYDNEY (LORD HALDANE), 1936. *Jamaica, the Blessed Island*. London, Faber and Faber.
- PAGET, HUGH, n.d. The free village system in Jamaica. *Caribbean Quarterly* 1: 7-19.
- ROSARIO, JOSÉ COLOMBÁN, 1930. The development of the Puerto Rican *jíbaro*. In V. Clark, et al., *Porto Rico and its problems*. Washington, D.C., The Brookings Institution, p. 537-575.
- SAUER, CARL O., 1954. Economic prospects of the Caribbean. In A. C. Wilgus (ed.), *The Caribbean: its economy*. Gainesville, University of Florida, p. 15-27.
- 1981. Indian food production in the Caribbean. *Geographical Review* 71(3): 272-280.
- SCOTT, REBECCA JARVIS, 1982. *Slave emancipation and the transition to free labor in Cuba, 1868-1895*. Doctoral dissertation, Princeton University.
- SILVERMAN, MARILYN, 1979. Dependency, mediation and class formation in rural Guyana. *American Ethnologist* 6(3): 466-490.
- STEWARD, JULIAN H., et al., 1956. *The people of Puerto Rico*. Urbana, University of Illinois Press.
- SMITH, MICHAEL G., 1962. *Kinship and community in Carriacou*. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- 1965. *The plural society in the British West Indies*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press.
- SMITH, RAYMOND T., 1956. *The negro family in British Guiana*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- STREET, JOHN M., 1960. *Historical and economic geography of the southwest peninsula of Haiti*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California (Berkeley).

STURTEVANT, WILLIAM C., 1961. Taino agriculture. In Johannes Wilbert (ed.), *The evolution of horticultural systems in native South America*. Caracas, Fundación La Salle, p. 69-82.

— 1969. History and ethnography of some West Indian starches. In Peter J. Ucko & G. W. Dimbleby (eds.), *The domestication and exploitation of plants and animals*. Chicago, Aldine, p. 177-199.

SIDNEY W. MINTZ,
Department of Anthropology
The Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, MD. 21218, U.S.A.

MICHAEL CRATON

WE SHALL NOT BE MOVED: POMPEY'S SLAVE REVOLT IN EXUMA ISLAND, BAHAMAS, 1830

Scholarly research into slave resistance in the British West Indies during formal slavery's final phase has hitherto followed public interest and concentrated on the three major rebellions that erupted between the abolition of the British slave trade in 1808 and the emancipation of British slaves in 1834–1838: in Barbados in 1816, Demerara in 1823, and Jamaica in 1831–2. This concentration stems from — and reinforces — a concern for the ways in which slave rebellion influenced the metropolitan movements first to ameliorate slave conditions and then to free the slaves. This in turn reflects and strengthens a predisposition to regard the ending of slavery as a process determined from outside; not just the nature and pace of the campaign but also its aims and end product. I am much more concerned with what the slaves themselves wanted, what forms their resistance took other than overt rebellion, and what they achieved by and for themselves (Craton 1982).¹

This new interest in the intrinsic ideology of the slaves rather than that of their metropolitan allies, has led to a belief that the slaves mainly wanted freedom to make a life of their own, to develop their own Afro-Caribbean culture and religion and, above all, to live as peasant farmers as independent as possible from the plantation system. In most areas, though to varying degrees, slaves were proto-peasants long before the emancipation movement gathered speed in Britain. Evidence of demands to extend the time allotted them to work their grounds and market their produce can be found in many, if not all, colonies; for example, in Dominica as early as 1791 and Tobago in 1807. When wearing the right kind of spectacles, one can see that such de-

mands were also of vital importance in the major slave rebellions of 1816, 1823 and, climactically, 1831–2 (Craton 1979b, 1980, 1982).

But unrest of this proto-peasant kind was not localised or spasmodic, and occurred not just in the most developed or exploited plantation colonies. On the fringes and margins of the plantation system the slaves had achieved their largest measure of socioeconomic independence, but this did not necessarily make them content or quiescent as long as slavery lasted, especially if their slow, insensible gains seemed suddenly threatened. Their reaction instead was more in line, perhaps, with what Frederick Douglass once said of the American slave: "Beat and cuff your slave, keep him hungry and spiritless, and he will follow the chain of his master like a dog; but feed and clothe him well — work him moderately — surround him with physical comfort — and dreams of freedom intrude (Douglass 1845: 56–73).

So, while in the true plantation colonies slaves were obviously fretting at slavery's bonds, on the outer margin of the Caribbean plantation sphere — in Belize and Tortola, for instance, as well as in the Bahamas — the slaves were also increasingly restless (Bolland 1977: 24–29, 73–79; Dookhan, 1975: 85–90). In these colonies the slaves were not subject to an intensification of the plantation system, rather the reverse, seizing opportunities to make a life of their own in conditions of economic decline, and resisting whenever gains they had made seemed compromised. What they did share with more severely worked slaves, though, was a growing awareness of sympathy and support in the metropolis for their aspirations and resistance, and even a sense that they could now look to the colonial governors as allies against the local slaveowners.

The inert colony of the Bahama Islands had been suddenly vitalised after 1783 by an influx of American Loyalists, which doubled the white population and trebled the number of slaves. Many of the emigrés were planters, who settled their slaves on Bahamian "Out Islands" until then unpopulated, attempting to replicate the plantation conditions they had left behind in the Carolinas, Georgia and Florida. They found the climate ideal for growing sea island cotton, but the exhaustion of the thin soil and

the depredations of the chenille bug left them unable to compete with American cotton once Eli Whitney's gin became effective after 1800 and the second Anglo-American war ended in 1814. Although a local planter, Joseph Eve, invented a windpowered variant of the gin, Bahamian cotton production, after passing its peak in 1791, had almost faded away by 1820 (Craton 1962, 1978, 1979a). As James Stephen perceptively noted in *Slavery Delineated* (1824: 454).

The planters, unable for the most part to find any article of exportable produce, were obliged to employ their slaves in raising provisions and stock. What were the results? To the proprietors, distress enough I admit, and to many of them ruin; to the slaves the effects have been ease, plenty, health, and the preservation and increase of their numbers by native means, all in a degree quite beyond example in any other part of the West Indies.²

Those planters who could, sold up and migrated once more. Some transferred their slaves to the old colony of Jamaica or to the new sugar plantations in Trinidad. But this traffic, revealed when the first Bahamian slave registration returns reached London, was effectively scotched by the abolitionists under Dr. Stephen Lushington in 1823, after about 2,000 Bahamian slaves — a fifth — had been transported (Eltis, 1972). Thereafter, the Bahamian plantocracy had to steer a delicate course between permitting their expanding and unprofitable slave population freedom to fend for themselves (thus cutting down on the cost of subsistence) and continuing to maintain their sociopolitical hegemony. This was made the more difficult by the retreat of most of the whites from the Out Islands — leaving the slaves there in a majority of at least 15:1 — and by the activities of an increasingly liberal imperial government which, on the one hand, insisted on the owners' obligations to their slaves and, on the other, was reluctant to support a decaying regime with military force.³ As one Governor memorably explained (Smyth 1832a) the parlous equation in 1832, the slaves were normally

... obedient from habit; from custom, from the necessity of having food and clothing which they could not otherwise obtain; and from the latent conviction they entertain that in case of necessity their masters could procure a force from Government to compel their obedience. . . . *A chain held together by such feeble links must not be strained.*

No case better illustrates the problems of Bahamian slave masters and the aspirations of their slaves than the well-documented history of the Rolle plantations in Exuma. Straddling the Tropic of Cancer north of Cuba, Great Exuma was one of the majority of Bahamian islands uninhabited before the American War of Independence. As large in area as Antigua and four times the size of Tortola, it is less compact than the former and, unlike the latter, almost completely flat, consisting of coral limestone covered with thin and patchy soil. It was first settled in 1784 by groups of Loyalists and their slaves, mainly from East Florida. Chief among these newcomers was Denys Rolle, who brought about 150 slaves and put them to grow cotton on four of the least infertile tracts of the island, totalling 5,000 acres. After reaching a peak production of some 60,000 pounds of cotton in 1791 (worth perhaps £ 3,000), the Rolle plantations slid into decline. Denys Rolle became an absentee, living in England while land and slaves were managed by an overseer in Exuma and an attorney in Nassau, the Bahamian capital, 135 miles to leeward. When Rolle died in 1797, the estate was inherited by his only son John, who, as a faithful parliamentary adherent of William Pitt, had been raised to the peerage as Baron Rolle (Craton 1978: 327).

Though the plantation staple faded, the Rolle slave population, through an unequalled combination of fortunate circumstances, flourished exceedingly. For a start, cotton cultivation at its worst was far healthier than sugar production, and the occupations which succeeded cotton were, generally, even less onerous. With definite seasons but none of the extremes, for example, of Virginia, the climate of the Bahamas was (and is) healthfully dry and without the almost seasonless, unwavering high temperatures and high humidity of the true tropics, where the environment was extremely conducive to debilitating and fatal diseases. Besides, this was a well-seasoned creole population, with only 19 African-born slaves in 1822 out of a total of 254, with an equal balance of sexes and an extremely healthy proportion of females within the fertile age range. Just as important, the Rolle slaves — whether encouraged by their master or by purely independent choice — generally favored permanent monogamous unions and lived in well-organised nuclear households. As the result of a

birthrate that rose to an average of 4.3 per cent per year between 1822 and 1834, coupled with a deathrate of only 0.8 per cent, the original 150 Rolle slaves had risen by natural increase to 254 by 1822 (when the Bahamian slave registration returns began) and became 357 by 1834 — the largest single holding of the 10,000 Bahamian slaves. This increase, averaging 3.5 per cent per year for the last 12 years of slavery and 2 per cent per year over the period since 1784, was comparable to the rates in the most fertile areas of Latin America today, rather than the dismal pattern found in nearly all slave sugar plantation colonies (Craton 1979a: 13–19; 1978: 325–327).

In flourishing plantation colonies, or even in countries like the USA where planters in declining staple areas (like Virginia) could capitalise by supplying slaves to expanding areas (the cotton states), a rapidly growing slave population was a bonus for the owners. Instead, with the ban on trading in slaves and increasing restrictions on shifting them from colony to colony (or, within the Bahamas, from island to island) Lord Rolle was a “slave breedar” with a disincentive. At a critical stage around 1820 the cost of providing each slave with the statutory allowances of food and clothing came close to the income that each could generate, and the prospect of a multiplying slave population multiplying his own indebtedness drove Rolle — in all other respects a Tory of Tories — steadily towards a false emancipationism.

As cotton declined, Lord Rolle's agents made attempts to diversify but never came up with a profitable solution. Some cotton continued to be grown, though scarcely worth the picking. In between the cotton rows, corn, peas and beans were raised, but as the meagre soil deteriorated and the slave population grew, the surplus available for export steadily grew less. Some stock were raised for the Nassau market, but overgrazing speeded the soil's impoverishment and in times of drought the animals ate into precious stores of provision and export crops. Much was hoped from salt production but Exuma, though subject to occasional droughts, was not quite reliably dry enough and in some years the whole production from Lord Rolle's two salinas was spoiled by rain.⁴

In the quest of elusive profit, Lord Rolle continued to exact as

much formal work as was feasible from his slaves. Yet, inevitably, he was forced to allow the slave family units to take on an increasingly proto-peasant form. Some 60 per cent of Rolle's slaves were listed as field workers — an even higher proportion than on sugar plantations — but daily tasks were gradually reduced and the time allowed for the slaves' own cultivation and other pursuits increased far beyond that nominally allowed in law. Because the owner could only afford to employ one white overseer in Exuma, most of the slaves were concentrated on the best of his four tracts of land, called Stevenstone after his estate in Devonshire. Those slaves left on the other holdings were almost totally without supervision, but all slaves had comparative freedom and mobility. Apart from the trips to the salinas under the eyes of the black drivers, slaves went off on their own for days at a time, working distant grounds, herding sheep and goats, or going fishing with line, net or spear. Some even had guns, to shoot migratory ducks and doves, the gentle "filymingo," or the elusive agouti and iguana. Though the whip could still be heard in Exuma, it seldom fell on the backs of the slaves, who had come to be almost as proudly independent, and as tied to their houses and lands, as any modern Bahamian Out Islanders. This, surely, was the sense of the heartfelt complaint by Lord Rolle's attorney in 1829: "We labour under very great difficulties here with large Gangs of Negroes in the Out Islands for there being no Magistrate or final authority on them. If the negroes refuse to obey the overseer what is he to do? ... Your Lordships Negroes with some Exceptions are *a very bad set indeed*" (Lees 1829).

What turned the perennial resistance of Rolle's slaves to plantation work into outright rebellion were the persistent attempts to shift all or some of them to more profitable islands. Rolle had been unable to transfer his slaves to any other colony before the total ban in 1824 because as an absentee he could not accompany them in person as required by law. But this did not stop him making several proposals for transferring his slaves to Trinidad, aimed at cutting his losses if not actually making a profit, under terms that might be acceptable to imperial government, emancipationists and slaves alike. The original proposal in 1825 suggested that the slaves should not be made to cultivate sugar

and should be promised that if they worked hard they could in due course earn enough to purchase the estate for themselves on a kind of instalment plan. They were also to be assured that families would not be split up and that female slaves born in Trinidad would be immediately free. The transfer, moreover, was to be voluntary — probably the least realistic suggestion of all (Rolle 1825:6).

Lord Rolle's 1825 proposal was turned down as impractical without being brought to the slaves' notice. But in 1828 Rolle made a more impassioned plea which did filter down to the slaves and provoke serious trouble. This time the owner claimed that the increased number of slaves (now 317) pressed dangerously on resources depleted by worn-out soil and recent hurricanes. Rolle accurately pointed out that the Trinidadian soil was far more fertile than that of Exuma, but was foolish enough to add that "upon Coffee and Cocoa Estates when once established the labour is comparatively an amusement" (Rolle 1828). This was properly quashed by the Colonial Secretary, who sharply wrote in the margin against Rolle's remark on the soils: "This is not only a non sequitur, but I shd think a nusquam sequitur. Where the soil is rich less labour is required to raise a given amount of produce, but more produce will be raised not less labour employed" (Rolle 1828: 235).

If the transfer of Lord Rolle's slaves to Trinidad was unlikely to receive official approval, it was certain to be rejected by the slaves themselves. Some time in 1828, Rolle's attorney, A. J. Lees (a JP and Member of the Legislative Council) went down to Exuma to ascertain whether the slaves were willing to be moved to Trinidad. Lees reported that "altho' they refused to go there they stated they had no objection to removing to any other of the Bahama Islands." Accordingly it was planned to ship off several families to Grand Bahama. But when the time came, the chosen slaves refused to embark on Lord Rolle's sloop, despite having been promised money for their crops and being allowed either to sell their hogs and fowls or carry them with them. At Lee's request the military commander in Nassau sent down an officer and 50 men, and the 20 slaves were transferred by force. In describing the events to the Colonial Secretary, Rolle had no doubt where to

place the ultimate blame: "These disturbances amongst the Negroes," he claimed, "are occasioned by the new *unfortunate* System [promoted by the] Liberals and Saints as they are termed ... I wish I had been as fortunate as one of that Sect Mr W — to have disposed of my Property in the West Indies before this" (Rolle 1829).

Much more trouble, though, lay in store. Early in 1830 Lees planned to transfer 77 of Rolle's Exumian slaves to Cat Island — then called San Salvador. There they were to be rented as a jobbing gang to a planter called Thompson, though to comply with the law Lees claimed that they were being resettled on another estate of Lord Rolle's. In making the transfer Lees pointed out that no husbands and wives were being separated, or any children under 14 separated from their parents. But the slaves were informed of the move only three days in advance and given just one weekend to pick their crops of peas and beans, thrash their corn and dispose of their poultry and pigs. Besides this they would have to abandon whole fields of Indian corn just planted for the following season (Smyth 1830a).

Under the leadership of a slave called Pompey, most of the selected slaves fled to the bush, remaining there until their provisions ran out five weeks later. Then 44 of them — five men, eight women and their families — seized Lord Rolle's salt boat and sailed it to Nassau, hoping to put their case to Governor Sir James Carmichael Smyth, who was widely rumoured to be a friend of the slaves.⁵ Approaching the capital, the salt boat was chased in by a Harbour Island sloop, the slaves seized and instantly thrown into the workhouse where, under the orders of Police Magistrate Duncombe, most of the adults were severely flogged, including five of the women.

Initially kept in ignorance of these events, Governor Smyth was incensed when he learned of them, particularly of the flogging of the female slaves. Lees and Duncombe were suspended and when it was learned that in fact Lord Rolle owned no land in Cat Island, Pompey and his crew were ordered to be carried back to Exuma.⁶ This action proved inflammatory. The arrival of the rebels at Stevenstone after two months' absence "caused a considerable degree of rejoicing and exaltation amongst their comrades." All

the slaves refused to work and the overseer, Thomas Thompson, sent an alarming report that open rebellion was imminent and that the slaves possessed "a considerable number of muskets" (Smyth 1830b).

Governor Smyth, somewhat regretting his leniency, forthwith sent Captain McPherson and 50 regular soldiers to Exuma in the schooner HMS *Skipjack*, closely followed by Patrick Grace, the Chief Constable, in the *Lady Rolle*. Arriving off Stevenstone in the middle of the night of Monday, June 20, the two vessels docked at 6 a.m. on Tuesday, to find the slaves quiet but making no preparations to go to work. The armed soldiers rounded them up and assembled them in Thompson's yard, where they were harangued by Grace, who later reported, "They all appeared to be very much dissatisfied as they understood they were to be free." Meanwhile the soldiers made a thorough search of the slave houses and discovered 25 "very indifferent muskets" and small quantities of powder and shot.

Later the same day Captain McPherson and half the soldiers set out overland to search the second slave village at Rolleville, five miles to the north. The Stevenstone slaves were not released until two hours after McPherson's party left, but Pompey, "knowing a Short cut to Rolle Ville along the Beach, got there before the Party and by giving the Alarm frustrated the intent of the Expedition" (McPherson 1830). Most of the slaves hid in the bush and only three more muskets were found in the huts. Pompey, however, was taken and brought back to Stevenstone early the next day.

That day Grace ordered Thompson to set the slaves back to work, but "the greater part refused under a plea that they had been for the last three years at work for themselves and wished still to remain so" (Grace 1830). Only when Pompey was given a public punishment of 39 lashes were the slaves persuaded to go to their allotted tasks. This was at 9.30 a.m., and at 2.30 p.m. the slaves returned with their drivers, announcing that they had completed their allotted day's work. On the two following days they were turned out to work at 6.30 a.m. but were back again in their houses by 1 p.m., going about their own business throughout the afternoons.

During this period Grace interrogated many of the slaves individually, and reported that their lack of cooperation was "in consequence of information received from George Clarke and William Neely, Free Black Men, that they were to be Free, and the land was to be divided among them." Having convinced the slaves of the falsity of these stories (a combination, perhaps of wish-fulfilment and delayed rumors of Rolle's Trinidad proposals), Grace returned to Nassau on Saturday, June 26, with McPherson and all but 20 of the soldiers, reporting, with some exaggeration, that he had left Lord Rolle's slaves "quiet and industrious" (Grace 1830: 367).

Pompey's miniature rebellion firmly established the principle that Bahamian slaves could not be moved with impunity against their will. The flogging of the Rolle women in April 1830, after an acrimonious struggle between Governor Smyth and the Bahamian legislature, also led to a ban on the flogging of females and other reforms, in 1831 and 1832 (Craton 1962: 200–202). Slave resistance, though, increased rather than decreased with the steady weakening of the masters' control and improvement in material conditions, and Lord Rolle's slaves in Exuma remained the most troublesome of all Bahamian slaves. Regularly between 1832 and 1834 the Governors had to report unrest in Exuma, as well as in Eleuthera, Cat Island, Crooked Island and the Ragged Islands (Smyth 1832b; Balfour 1833, 1834a). In October 1833, for example, Acting Governor Balfour reported Lord Rolle's slaves "refractory," having been told by Taylor, the new attorney, that they refused to work and offered violence. On inquiry, Balfour decided that Taylor was as much to blame as the slaves. "The details which he gave me," he wrote to London, "proved that although the Slaves on the property are not ill-treated in the Article of Labour, yet that sufficient care had not been taken to supply them with the quantities of food allowed by law." Taylor was firmly told "that if the literate Manager neglected the law, what response could you expect from the illiterate slave?" Balfour, though reluctant, was still prepared to send soldiers if necessary to quell the slaves. "Their passive resistance will no doubt cease on the sight of the King's Troops," he concluded, "but I dislike extremely to use the arm of power unless when urged by necessity" (Balfour 1833).

Such a soft approach was of little avail. As the Emancipation Bill passed in London and awaited its implementation by the Bahamian legislature, the Rolle slaves became even less tractable. In January 1834, Lord Rolle wrote to the Colonial Secretary that he had heard from Taylor that his slaves in Exuma had "severely beaten and bruised" their new overseer, one Hall, and had only calmed down on the arrival of a Special Magistrate and the threat of the sending of troops. "I attribute the disorderly Change in the Conduct of my Negroes," wrote Rolle, conveniently forgetting the previous incidents of insubordination, "to the Encouragement they experience from what passed in the last Sessions of Parliament . . . that they were all free and were to be found every thing by me" (Rolle 1834a).

During the transition from full slavery to apprenticeship, Lord Rolle's slaves proved more troublesome than any others in the British West Indies. As Balfour wrote to London on September 13, 1834, he had been compelled to send troops to Exuma three times that year because of the insubordination of Lord Rolle's "Gang" and now decided to station a detachment permanently in the island. Rolle's slaves, who became officially apprentices on August 1, 1834, had not committed any overt acts of rebellion, but were said to be "content with refusing to work, so long as the Troops are absent. But the mere presence of the latter has always been sufficient to restore discipline" (Balfour 1834b).

This assessment was echoed and added to by Lord Rolle himself (Rolle 1834b). On August 11, 1834, he wrote from Devonshire to the Colonial Secretary — in a scraggly scrawl that suggests an old man at the end of his tether — that he had heard from Taylor that his "slaves" still would not work,

except the Soldiers are on the Spot — the Moment the Troops leave the Island they are again in a State of Insubordination as before — in Consequence of this Representation I am inclined to send out Instructions to discharge the Negroes from their Apprenticeship but first to request through you the Cooperation of Government — My Instructions would be in my Power of Attorney that it should contain full Powers to convey the lands for the use of the Negroes during their Apprenticeship.

Such a unilateral act of emancipation, or abrogation of responsibility, was, of course, unacceptable. Lord Rolle's offer was offici-

ally rejected. However, like many other Bahamian Out Islanders, Rolle's ex-slaves seem to have served a purely nominal apprenticeship, and when they became "full free" on August 1, 1838 they assumed full possession of their ex-owner's lands under a self-determined commonage system. All of Rolle's ex-slaves also assumed the surname Rolle, and to this day any of the 4,000 Bahamian Rolles can theoretically claim a house lot or provision ground allotment in Exuma (Craton 1978: 354-5). Over the years since 1838 a quite spurious legend has grown up about the alleged philanthropy of John, Lord Rolle, who is commonly said to have been one of only two Bahamian masters who deeded their lands to their ex-slaves at Emancipation.⁷ In fact, no such deed has ever been traced. It may well have been a convenient fiction, invented by the first generation of black peasant farmers called Rolle; Pompey's generation. Surely, rather than giving credit to a querulous and self-serving absentee it should be argued that by their uncooperative behaviour and actual resistance the slaves Lord Rolle ostensibly owned virtually won independence and land for themselves.

Unfortunately, the story does not have an altogether happy ending. In the Bahamas as in all the British West Indian colonies, the plantocratic bourgeoisie showed such tireless ingenuity in turning the changes brought by Emancipation to their own advantage that it is possible to claim that the ending of formal slavery and the substitution of wage labour was simply a hegemonic trick. Certainly, generous compensation was paid to owners (though not to slaves) and the initial transition was smoothed to the planters' advantage by the Apprenticeship system of 1834-1838. In those plantation colonies with little or no spare land the planters were sitting pretty because the ex-slaves were forced to accept what work was offered at wages driven down by competition among themselves. Two colonies, indeed, Antigua and Bermuda, were so confident that they dispensed with the Apprenticeship system altogether. Barbados even more successfully enforced wage labour on the ex-slaves to the planters' benefit; so much so that Barbadian sugar production actually climbed and reached a peak after Emancipation without sub-

stantial technical modernisation. Planters in plantation colonies with more spare land — most notably, the three largest; Jamaica, Trinidad and British Guiana — engaged in endless subterfuges, with marked success, to solve their alleged “labour shortages”; in other words, to ensure a competitive labour pool forced to work only when they were wanted, at wages even below the level of subsistence (Hall 1959; Wood 1968; Adamson 1972).

Yet even in the fringe and marginal colonies the local oligarchies showed great resilience after Emancipation. This was especially true in the Bahamas, despite an almost complete absence of plantations and a desperately impoverished economy. The whites themselves were poor enough, but the blacks were destitute and politically powerless. The situation was most graphically described at first hand by a disgruntled magistrate, L. D. Powles, in his book about the black Bahamian sponge fishers, *Land of the Pink Pearl* (1888); but as anyone familiar with the Bahamas down to the eventual victory of the black Progressive Liberal Party in January 1967 knows, the white minority — led by the mercantile clique nicknamed “The Bay Street Boys” — sustained their power in remarkable fashion into modern times (Hughes 1981).

How this was achieved can be sensed even before the end of slavery. Governor Carmichael Smyth (1832b: 302) reported to the Colonial Office in August 1832 that,

... it has long been a custom in this Colony to permit the more intelligent of the Slaves, and more particularly Artificers, to find employment for themselves & to pay to their owners either the whole or such a proportion of what they may gain as may be agreed between the Parties. Almost any slave is anxious to enjoy this Species of Liberty and will readily promise and undertake to pay more than, at times, he may be able to acquire. Many of them have a sort of Account Current with their Owners, and in hopes of better times get deeper into debt every month.

This was clearly the origin of the notorious “truck system” of the time of L. D. Powles and later.

The Out Island farmer-fishermen such as the Rolles of Exuma were scarcely less vulnerable, though vulnerable in a different way, being subject to Malthusian rather than Marxian constraints. In slavery days the population increased almost up to the limits of available lands even when what the slaves produced for

themselves was augmented by the issues of food by their masters decreed by law. After slavery ended the population continued to increase though the issues stopped, and as the soils deteriorated with overworking, overgrazing (particularly by goats) and under-fertilisation, undernourishment and even actual starvation threatened.

The ex-slave Rolles soon suffered from a shortage of workable land. Despite great attachment to their common land they did move on voluntarily in the later nineteenth and early twentieth century into unpopulated or underpopulated islands, especially Andros. This island, though agriculturally no richer than Exuma, was at least closer to Nassau and the markets for vegetables and fish, and was also the island closest to the sponge fields of the Great Bahama Bank. In Andros the ex-Exumians remained until the very recent past among the poorest, blackest and yet hardest-working, independent-minded and culturally-retentive sections of the Bahamian population (Otterbein 1966).

Those who remained in Exuma were generally least fortunate of all. Today the thousands of Rolles are uniformly proud of their commonage rights in what is for them truly a "Family Island."²⁸ But few indeed actually opt to stay in the island or return. In modern times, Nassau's island, New Providence, has sucked in so many Out Islanders and spawned so many more people that it contains well over half the total Bahamian population, while the Out Islands are inhabited mainly by the very old and the very young. Ironically, the areas of free commonage in Exuma contain some of the poorest and most deprived of all Out Island communities. Some people still live in wattle and thatch huts without electricity, water or sanitation. The land is quite inadequate for subsistence under modern standards. But it cannot be developed either because of the very Commonage Law. Since the land belongs to all the Rolles in common it cannot, for example, be sold or leased to build hotels, bring in wealthy foreigners and provide lucrative employment for the locals — as has happened on many other Bahamian Out Islands.

Thus we end with a double paradox, or apparent paradox. Not only did some of the most active and effective slave resistance occur in those colonies without an intensive plantation system; but

also, even in areas like the Bahamas Out Islands where slaves were virtually protopeasants, their achievements in anticipating and reinforcing a form of freedom did not necessarily bring them a lasting prosperity or political power. Clearly, this is another story, calling out for detailed examination (Craton 1982, 1983).⁹

NOTES

1. This theme was the mainspring of *Testing the Chains* (Craton 1982), of which the present article was an offshoot.
2. The Bahamas, with almost exactly the same land area as Jamaica (4,400 square miles), had approximately 10,000 slaves against 300,000 in Jamaica. In 1800 the ratio between blacks and whites in the Bahamas was about 4:1; in Barbados it was 5:1, in Jamaica, 12:1.
3. The ratio of slaves to whites and free coloureds in New Providence, the island of the colonial capital, Nassau, was approximately 3:2:2. The conditions were very different between New Providence and the Bahamian Out Islands (Craton 1979a: 10-17).
4. "I have order'd them every reasonable Indulgence on my Part for their Benefit and Comfort and as a Proof the whole annual Income of the Estate has been spent on them... It has been stated to me that by their neglect a great quantity of Salt that has been raked was destroyed by the Rain. It was I understand worth from Five to Seven Thousand dollars" (Rolle 1834a).
5. James Carmichael Smyth (1779-1838), a soldier engineer on Wellington's staff at Waterloo, was made a baronet in 1821 and was later Governor of Demerara-Essequibo at the time of Emancipation.
6. Smyth's informant was a Cat Island planter called Hepburn, who was fearful of the Rolle slaves' reputation for rebelliousness (Smyth 1830a).
7. The other alleged benefactor was Judge Sandilands, the original owner of what is now Fox Hill Village, almost a suburb of Nassau (Craton 1962: 210).
8. In a move to promote greater integration, the P.L.P. government renamed the Bahamas Out Islands "Family Islands" in 1975.
9. A beginning is attempted by the examination of the "Angel Gabriel" riots in Guyana in 1856, the Morant Bay Rebellion in Jamaica in 1865 and the Federation Riots in Barbados in 1876 in the Epilogue of *Testing the chains* and in a forthcoming article (Craton 1982, 1983).

REFERENCES

The following abbreviations are employed: PRO (Public Record Office, London); CO (Colonial Office papers, in Public Record Office, London). In all cases, these refer to manuscript materials.

ADAMSON, ALAN H., 1972. *Sugar without slaves; the political economy of British Guiana, 1838-1904*. New Haven, Yale University Press.

BALFOUR, JAMES, 1833. Letter to Lord Stanley, October 1. CO 23/89, 152-3, PRO.

— 1834a. Letter to Spring-Rice, September 9. CO 23/91, 379-80, PRO.

— 1834b. Letter to Spring-Rice, September 13. CO 23/91, 380, PRO.

BOLLAND, O. NIGEL, 1977. *The formation of a colonial society: Belize from Conquest to Crown Colony*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press.

CRATON, MICHAEL, 1962. *A history of the Bahamas*. London, Collins.

— 1978. Hobbesian or Panglossian? The two extremes of slave conditions in the British Caribbean, 1783 to 1834. *William and Mary Quarterly* (3) 35: 324-356.

— 1979a. Changing patterns of slave families in the British West Indies. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 10, 1: 1-35.

— 1979b. Proto-peasant revolts? The late slave rebellions in the British West Indies, 1816-1832. *Past & Present* 85: 99-125.

— 1980. The passion to exist; slave rebellions in the British West Indies, 1650-1832. *Journal of Caribbean History* 13: 1-20.

— 1982. *Testing the chains; resistance to slavery in the British West Indies*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press.

— 1983. Continuity not change; the incidence of unrest among ex-slaves in the British West Indies, 1838-1876. Article forthcoming.

DOOKHAN, ISAAC, 1975. *A history of the British Virgin Islands, 1672-1970*. Barbados,

DOUGLASS, FREDERICK, 1845. *Narrative of the life of Frederick Douglass, an American slave. Written by himself*. Boston, Anti-Slavery Office.

ELTIS, DAVID, 1972. The traffic in slaves between the British West Indian colonies, 1807-1833. *Economic History Review* 25, 55-64.

GRACE, JOHN, 1830. Report dated June 29 (enclosed in SMYTH 1830b, 366-7).

HALL, DOUGLAS G., 1959. *Free Jamaica, 1838–1865; an economic history*. New Haven, Yale University Press.

HUGHES, COLIN A., 1981. *Race and politics in the Bahamas*. St. Lucia, University of Queensland Press.

LEES, A. J., 1829. Letter to Lord Rolle, August 22 (quoted in ROLLE 1829, 376).

MCPHERSON, JAMES, 1830. Report dated June 29 (enclosed in SMYTH 1830b, 364–5).

OTTERBEIN, KEITH, 1966. *The Andros islanders; a study of family organisation in the Bahamas*. Lawrence, Kansas University Press.

POWLES, L. D., 1888. *Land of the Pink Pearl*. London, Sampson Low.

ROLLE, JOHN, LORD, 1825–6. Proposals quoted in letters of Governor Woodford to Lord Bathurst, December 31, 1825, April 13, 1826, CO 295/67, 219, 295/71, 26–7, PRO.

— 1828. Two petitions enclosed in letter from Col. Farqharson to Huskisson, October 12, CO 295/78, 233–238, PRO.

— 1829. Letter to Murray, August 22, CO 23/81, 375–6, PRO.

— 1834a. Letters to Spring-Rice, January 6, 10, CO 23/92, 490–493, PRO.

— 1834b. Letter to Spring-Rice, August 11, CO 23/92, 497, PRO.

SMYTH, JAMES CARMICHAEL, 1830a. Letters to Murray, January 13, March 22, June 9, CO 23/82, PRO.

— 1830b. Letter to Murray, June 29, CO 23/82, 355–367.

— 1832a. Letter to Lord Goderich, August 2, CO 23/87, 302–3, PRO.

— 1832b. Letter to Lord Goderich, August 9, CO 23/87, 345–350, PRO.

STEPHEN, JAMES, 1824. *The slavery of the British West India colonies delineated*. 2 vols., London, 1824, 1830. Volume One (1824), Appendix III.

WOOD, DONALD, 1968. *Trinidad in transition; the years after slavery*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

MICHAEL CRATON
Department of History
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

KENNETH M. BILBY

HOW THE "OLDER HEADS" TALK: A JAMAICAN
 MAROON SPIRIT POSSESSION LANGUAGE AND ITS
 RELATIONSHIP TO THE CREOLES OF SURINAME
 AND SIERRA LEONE

Introduction.....	37
The meaning of 'deep' language	39
Some distinctive characteristics of 'deep' language	42
The question of preservation	56
Historical questions	59
Notes	62
Appendix A-C	70
References	86

In the interior of Jamaica exist four major Maroon communities, inhabited by the descendants of slaves who escaped from plantations during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and gained their freedom by treaty in 1739. The present-day Maroon settlements — Moore Town, Charles Town, and Scott's Hall in the east, and Accompong in the west — are now nearly indistinguishable, on the surface, from other rural Jamaican villages.¹ Among the things which continue to set the Maroons apart from their non-Maroon neighbors are a number of linguistic features which appear to be found only in Maroon areas. The Maroon settlements have been described by two leading authorities as "centres of linguistic conservatism" (Cassidy & Le Page 1980: xli); but very little substantial documentation has yet appeared in print to back up this claim.²

While conducting an ethnographic study among the Jamaican Maroons in 1977–8, I encountered a number of complex linguistic phenomena which were closely tied to the traditional ceremonial sphere in the various communities. A large part of my field study centered around the traditional Maroon ritual known as *Kromanti Play* or *Kromanti dance*.³ While observing and participating in these

ceremonies, it soon became apparent to me that several more or less distinct language forms, or linguistic "layers," were involved. Kromanti ceremonies center around the possession of participants by ancestral spirits, and therein lies the basis of this linguistic complexity; the ancestors have their own form of speech, quite different from that of living Maroons, and it is this which must be used in order to communicate with them. Any Kromanti Play, then, must involve not only the language of the living, but that of the dead as well. The language of the living is the language of normal, everyday discourse — a form of Jamaican Creole which is essentially the same as that spoken throughout the island. The language of the ancestors is also a form of Jamaican Creole, but one which differs sharply from even the most basilectal forms yet documented, and is only partially intelligible to non-Maroons and those who are unfamiliar with Kromanti Play.⁴

When the living — those who are not possessed by spirits — speak to one another during Kromanti ceremonies, they employ the normal creole. When they address those in possession, they attempt to talk "deep," so that the visiting ancestors will understand. The possessed themselves, either when addressing the unpossessed or others in possession, use only the "deep language" (as it is called by Maroons) which is the subject of this paper. Finally, there is a third language form used in Kromanti Play, known simply as *Kromanti* — the language of the earliest ancestors, many of whom were born in Africa. *Kromanti*, which is clearly not a form of Jamaican Creole and displays very little English content, is in fact not a functioning language, but rather a highly fragmentary ritual "language" consisting of a number of set phrases and expressions.⁵

This paper will not be concerned, except indirectly, with either the normal creole spoken by the Maroons or the *Kromanti* "language"; instead, it will focus on the "middle" language, the "deep" creole spoken by those who are conceptually situated in between the living and the most ancient ancestors. This "spirit language" is of special interest, I believe, for it contains features which point clearly to a relationship with the other Atlantic creoles, and in particular, with the creoles of Suriname. As we shall see, several of the features characteristic of Maroon pos-

session speech occur regularly in none of the other Atlantic creoles, except those of Suriname, and Krio, the English-based creole of Sierra Leone. While this paper is primarily descriptive in aim, these parallels with a few particular creoles raise a number of interesting historical questions, and I will address these at a later point. My interpretation of this material is provisional, and I offer the following description in the hope that other creolists will find it useful, and perhaps will be able to make further sense of the data.⁶

THE MEANING OF "DEEP" LANGUAGE

Before proceeding with a discussion of the linguistic data, a bit of contextualization is necessary. It is important to have some idea of both *how* the language form under discussion is used, and how it is conceptualized by those who use it. Furthermore, it is necessary to point out some of the ways in which extralinguistic factors (strictly speaking) affect the final speech output.

In a sense, the Maroons themselves possess an indigenous model of their language history which roughly corresponds to current linguistic theories concerning creolization and decreolization. At the base of the Maroon continuum — as conceptualized by Maroons themselves — is the "Kromanti language" of the first Maroons, who are said to have been born in Africa. It is said that on the very rare occasions that these earliest ancestors possess dancers at Kromanti Play, they speak nothing but Kromanti.⁷ Ancestors from all subsequent generations speak a "deep" form of language which is recognized by Maroons as being clearly distinct from Kromanti (although their speech always includes a number of isolated Kromanti words and expressions). With each descending generation, the ancestral language is thought to become progressively closer to that which is spoken in normal contexts by Maroons today.⁸

This somewhat vague notion of a single shaded continuum notwithstanding, there are actually three fundamentally distinct linguistic forms (or levels) used in Kromanti Play: (1) "standard" Jamaican Creole; (2) the "deep" language (or "spirit language") of the possessing ancestors; and (3) Kromanti, the African lan-

guage of the earliest Maroons (and thus, the "deepest" form there is). This fundamental distinction between Kromanti and the ancestral deep creole (which is English-based) is made by Maroons themselves, for whom the two forms of language have very different significance. Kromanti (also known as "Country") is highly sacred; the deep creole is much less so. Whereas the latter functions, like normal language, to communicate specific messages, much of the "Country" or "Kromanti language" has lost its meaning and taken on "magical" functions. Kromanti is imbued with inherent power, and its primary function today is the attraction and invocation of ancestors — a function which the deep creole, in itself, is thoroughly incapable of performing.⁹

Although the "spirit language" which forms the main subject of this paper is clearly distinct from the Kromanti "language," it includes a limited number of isolated Kromanti lexical items, most of them referring to ritually-significant objects. These Kromanti lexical items are acknowledged by Maroons as such, but when used in isolation, in order to denote specific objects (e.g., "ingkeswa" means "egg"), they lack the invocational power which inheres in a spoken stream of Kromanti.¹⁰

Upon first hearing, the "spirit language" of the Maroons sounds perhaps more different from the normal creole than it actually is. What creates this impression is the style of delivery. The speech of possessed persons is conditioned by cultural beliefs regarding the fundamental character of Maroon spirits. Such spirits are seen as being inherently fierce, easily excitable, and generally erratic in temperament. It follows that their speech is also erratic and exaggerated in a number of ways. Possessed persons speak at an abnormally rapid clip, and in a very taut, high-pitched tone of voice. The contour of their speech differs considerably from that of normal speech, registering wild ups and downs of pitch, and abrupt shifts of rhythm. All of this contributes to the unintelligibility of this "deep" language to those who are not familiar with Kromanti ceremonies. (When unpossessed participants in Kromanti Play address possessed individuals, they generally attempt to use the ancestral deep creole, but they speak it in a more normal tone of voice, and in most cases actually combine features of the deep creole with the normal creole, rather than "descending" fully to the deeper level.)

In connection with the above, a word is in order concerning the conditions under which the linguistic "sample" presented in this paper was gathered. Although I heard the Maroon "spirit language" spoken repeatedly in the context of Kromanti ceremonies, and to a limited extent learned to use it in order to communicate with possessed Maroons, it was not possible, except in one or two instances, to make tape-recordings of actual possession speech. Tape-recording was absolutely forbidden during actual episodes of possession, and I was warned that any tape-recorder in operation at such a time would be destroyed by the possessed individual. This restriction was very much in keeping with the canons of secrecy applying to Kromanti Play. (Non-Maroons who remain at the site of a Kromanti ceremony after spirit possession has occurred must be sworn to a ritual oath of secrecy; I was obliged to undergo this ritual several times, but was later partially released from the oath by those who had administered it.)¹¹

Although tape-recording was prohibited (particularly in Moore Town) whenever possession was in progress, the evidence presented in this paper is not based solely on my own memory of the "deep" language, or the notes I took after ceremonies. During the latter part of my field trip I was able to record several informants who were willing, when asked, to demonstrate the way in which spirits talk — that is, to speak for the recorder "as if" they were in possession. In each such case, the result was a recording which closely adhered to actual possession speech (although "toned down" in style of delivery). (A segment of one such performance has been transcribed and included in Appendix A.) Additional, unsolicited recordings were made of unpossessed individuals addressing ancestral spirits — using an approximation of the "spirit language" — while pouring libations (see Appendix B for one example). These recordings, along with my field notes, form the basis of the discussion which follows. To lend this data further support, and to help clarify certain matters, I will occasionally make reference to the manuscript of an unpublished book written by the present Colonel, or leader, of the Moore Town Maroons, C. L. G. Harris (*The Maroons of Moore Town: A Colonel Speaks*). This work, a general account of life in Moore Town, includes a good deal of valuable linguistic material and a number

of comments on language in Moore Town which have significance for the arguments which follow.¹²

SOME DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF “DEEP LANGUAGE”

The following brief description of Maroon “spirit language” is concerned primarily with phonological and lexical features, for these are the areas in which this language-form and the normal creole differ most clearly (syntax, for instance, seems to be essentially the same in the two forms of language). In each subsection below, I will point out how the features under discussion contrast with normal Jamaican Creole, using Cassidy & Le Page (1980) as my primary authority on the latter.

A) Vowel Epithesis

Many words in the “spirit language” feature vowel final syllables; in most cases, the equivalent words in normal Jamaican Creole lack this feature. I recorded the following examples (and it is likely that others exist):¹³

waka	“walk”	swiri	“to swear”
luku	“look”	seke	“sick”
gudu	“good”	taki	“talk”
naki	“to hit”	teka	“to take”
lasi	“arse”	wudu	“forest”
fete	“to fight”	wete	“white”
dede	“dead”	aksi	“to ask”
ede	“head”	blada	“blood”
bigi	“big”	dago	“dog”
blaka	“black”	hagu	“hog”
beti	“to bet”	manu	“man”
futu	“leg, foot”	brada	“broad”
gyala	“girl”	arete	“all right”
mutu	“mouth”	hanu	“arm, hand”
meke	“to make”		

According to Cassidy & Le Page (1980: lxiii), vowel epithesis of this sort is rare in modern Jamaican Creole, and most of the few examples they cite (*yeri* "hear," *taki* "talk," *rata* "rat," *uona* "own," *rakatuon* "rockstone," *disaya* "this here") are referred to by them as "archaic." Alleyne (1980: 62–66) concurs with this conclusion, and adds to their list the words *ku* "look!" (which he believes to be derived from an earlier form, *luku*; see also Cassidy & Le Page 1980: 266), and *futu* "big clumsy foot." In Maroon possession speech, in contrast, vowel epithesis is one of the most noticeable features, and part of what makes any particular utterance recognizable as "authentic" spirit language. When Maroons are in possession, they virtually always use the vowel final forms of all the words listed above, as opposed to their normal creole equivalents.

According to several authorities, vowel epithesis is found as a regular feature in none of the modern Atlantic creoles other than those of Suriname (Hancock 1969: 24; Johnson 1974: 125–126; Smith 1977: 1; Alleyne 1980: 62–66). It is thus of particular interest that this is such a prominent feature in the speech of possessed Maroons.

B) Liquids

In "deep" language, many words which feature /l/ in normal creole regularly display /r/ instead. For example:

bere	"belly"
kreba	"clever"
ogri	"evil" (from "ugly")
pre	"place"
kre	"to clear"
priis	"pleased"
krem	"climb"
pripri	"people"
swara	"swallow"
bro	"to blow"
sjref	"self"
braka	"black"

One word which does not occur at all in modern Jamaican Creole also seems to have been derived from a similar process:

prandes "house, home, yard" (from "plantation")

Alleyne (1980: 61–62) states that in the earliest Afro-American dialects, no phonemic distinction between /l/ and /r/ existed; he adds that what he calls "the primitive /l/ ~ /r/ variation" occurs regularly today only in the Suriname creoles. In all the other English-based Atlantic creoles, according to him, this feature occurs only in a few isolated cases, which he refers to as "relics." (For examples from Krio, see Hancock 1969: 68.) For Jamaican Creole, the only documented surviving cases, according to Cassidy & Le Page (1980: lx), are: *flitaz* "fritters," *talabred* "thoroughbred," *praimali* "primary," *fingl* "finger," and *brusil* "Bluefields." Alleyne (*ibid.*: 62) points out, interestingly, that almost all of the Jamaican cases show a preference for /l/ over /r/, in all positions.

The Maroon cases cited above, then, go against the general Jamaican rule. The only cases I recorded which show a preference for /l/ over /r/ are:

lasi	"arse"
blada	"brother"
debeklin	"dawn" (from "day-breaking") ¹⁴

For most of the cases showing a preference for /r/ over /l/ cited above, there are direct parallels in the Suriname creoles.¹⁵

Another interesting feature occurring in Maroon possession speech (though only in a very few of the documented words) is liquid deletion. For instance:

kii	"to kill"
puu	"to pull, to take off"
te	"to tell"
baka	"black"

This feature is common in the Suriname creoles, Saramaccan and Ndjuka, but rare in the other Atlantic creoles (Alleyne 1980: 62).

Finally, the "deep" language includes a few examples of the

liquifying of /d/ or /ð/:

tere	“today”
grāfara	“grandfather”

These examples have not been documented for “standard” Jamaican Creole, although a few others have, such as: *nombari* “nobody,” *tara* “t’other,” and *impyurens* “impudence” (Cassidy & Le Page 1980: lx). In the Suriname creoles, on the other hand, the liquifying of /d/ has occurred in many cases, and is part of a process which has been shown to have considerable historical depth (Smith 1978).

C) /ai/ becomes /e/

There are several cases of words which feature /ai/ in the normal creole, but whose equivalents in the “spirit language” always have /e/ instead:

<i>Deep Creole</i>		<i>Normal Creole</i>
krem	“to climb”	klaim
tem	“time”	taim
prem	“to prime, prepare”	praim
re	“to ride”	raid
wete	“white”	wait
fete	“to fight”	fait
arete	“all right”	arait
net	“night”	nait

According to Hancock (1969: 68), in both the Suriname creoles and Krio, English /ai/ (or /aj/) becomes /e/ (or /ɛ/) — “a fairly regular shift not shared by other creoles, although occurring in a few Guyana Creole items.” Cassidy & Le Page (1980) make no mention at all of such a shift for Jamaican Creole.

D) Metathesis of Liquids

Below are a few examples from the deep creole of what appears to

be metathesis:

sjref	“self” ¹⁶
pripri	“people”
blakabwai	“bottle” (from “bottle-boy”) ¹⁷

In a recent paper, Sebba (1982) has shown that metathesis of liquids to avoid liquid-plus-consonant clusters occurred regularly in early Suriname creole; he further concludes that such metathesis was also a feature of several other creoles at an early stage. (It should be pointed out that the last two examples above differ from the sort of metathesis discussed by Sebba, in that they are derived from original English words which featured consonant-plus-schwa-plus-liquid clusters, rather than liquid-plus-consonant.)

Although metathesis of liquids is not uncommon in Jamaican Creole (Cassidy & Le Page 1980: lxiii), the above examples apparently occur only in the Maroon “spirit language.”

E) Vowel Nasalization

In the Maroon deep creole, certain words feature a sort of vowel nasalization which does not occur in normal Jamaican Creole (except in a few instances). In the words of C. L. G. Harris, the Colonel of the Moore Town Maroons, “in some Maroon words there is a nasal *N* which cannot be properly represented in English” (Harris n.d.: 116). The “nasal *N*” to which the Colonel refers is in fact not a nasal consonant at all, but rather, a nasalization of vowels in certain words. The vowels nasalized in this way in the deep creole sound somewhat similar to the nasalization of vowels which is so common in French.¹⁸ A few examples follow:

nyās	“yam(s)”
nyūman	“man” (from “young man”)
grāfa	“grandfather”
wī	“when”
kō	“to come”
kō	“cousin”
nāsi	“spider” (from “anansi”)

Alleyne (1980: 177) refers to this sort of vowel nasalization in Afro-American creoles as “a recognizable Niger Congo continuity.”

F) *na*

Na is used in a number of ways in the deep creole. First, it acts as a verb, “to be” (in the sense of equating); secondly, it is used as a locative preposition. Several examples, taken from full sentence contexts, are offered below:¹⁹

i na ogri sonti
 (“It is an evil thing.”)

na di wan dat
 (“That’s the one.”)

na huma kuda du mi dat sOnti?
 (“Who could have done that thing to me?”)

mi na gaad amaiti
 (“I am God Almighty.”)

wĩ yu min de waka na da pre...
 (“When you were walking at that place...”)

wen di suma kõ na pre...
 (“When the person came to the place...”)

if mi no min bin na da pre...
 (“If I hadn’t been at that place...”)

yankipong bles na yu
 (“God bless [to] you.”)

im put im afana na sasi
 (“He put his machete to the ground.”)

In his manuscript, Colonel Harris of Moore Town offers several

other examples:

Emba ting seh Chaal Harris no prem aw tem na foo-foo summa.

(“Anybody who thinks that Charles Harris does not prime himself at all times is a foolish person.”) (Harris n.d.: 56)

Na umma fi peak fi mi...?

(“Who is to speak for me...?”) (ibid: 29)

teh mi ef na Nyakepong ta’k na mi

(“tell me if it is God who talked to me”) (ibid: 3)

na hunty yu cohn yeh fi?

(“why [is what] did you come here [for]?”) (ibid: 105)

nynneah no suhntie, na warra na suhntie?

(“if food is nothing, what is something?”) (ibid: 105)

ta’k na mi...

(“talk to me...”) (ibid: 3)

In some contexts, *na* acts in a way equivalent to how *a* (or sometimes *da*) works in modern Jamaican Creole — for instance, when used as an equating verb (“*na di wan dat*” would be “*a di wan dat*” in normal basilectal Jamaican Creole); or when used as a locative preposition (“im put im afana *na sasi*” would be “im put im mashiet *a grong*” in the normal creole). However, it is also sometimes used in a way which apparently has no parallel in Jamaican Creole — i.e., as a preposition associated with the verbs “talk” and “listen” (“*taki*” and “*arik*”). The following sentences, for example, are frequently heard at Kromanti Play: “*tak na mi*” (“talk to me”—in this context the final vowel of “*taki*” is usually deleted), and “*arik na mi*” (“listen to me”). In the normal creole, these sentences would be rendered, respectively, “*taak tu mi*” and “*lisn tu mi*” (or, alternately, “*lisn mi*,” or “*yer mi*”). According to Cassidy & Le Page (1980), modern Jamaican Creole does not make use of *na* for any of the above-mentioned functions.

In Krio and the Suriname Creoles, however — and also in several West African pidgins — *na* functions both as an equating verb and a locative preposition, precisely as it does in the Jamaican Maroon “spirit language.” Apparently, none of the English-based New World creoles other than those of Suriname include this feature (Hancock 1969: 36–37; 64–65; 66; 68), although some of them have near equivalents (such as Guyana Creole *a* or Jamaican Creole *a/da*).²⁰ Once again, we are confronted with evidence which points to some sort of relationship with both Krio and the Suriname creoles.

G) Verbal Markers

There exist in the Maroon “spirit language” two verbal markers which apparently do not occur at all in normal Jamaican Creole: the durative or progressive marker, *e* or *he*; and the future marker, *sa*. A few examples of their use follow:

na honti yu he du ye?
 (“What are you doing here?”)

mi e waka na yengkungku pre
 (“I’m walking in a Maroon place.”)

mi sa du so
 (“I’m going to do that.”)

i sa jet i?
 (“Will you get it?”)

mi sa jet i
 (“I will get it.”)

These verbal markers appear to be used in the deep creole interchangeably with those which occur in the normal creole (i.e., the durative markers, *a*, *da*, or *de*, and the future marker, *wi*).

Hancock (1969: 62–63) tells us that *e* is used as a durative marker in Sranan and Ndjuka (along with an alternate form, *de*),

but it occurs in none of the other English-based Atlantic creoles represented in his word-list. Likewise, *sa* is a future marker in Sranan, Ndjuka, and Saramaccan, but is found in none of the other creoles, except that of Guyana (*ibid*). According to Cassidy & Le Page (1980), none of these tense-aspect markers — *e*, *he*, or *sa* — occur in modern Jamaican Creole.

H) Interrogatives and Personal Pronouns

One of the most interesting aspects of the Maroon deep creole is the existence of a number of interrogative words (sometimes also used as relative pronouns) which are quite unlike anything found in modern Jamaican Creole. The following occur regularly in the speech of possessed Maroons:

onti, honti ²¹	what?	(also, sometimes, which?, where?, or who?)
uma, huma	who?	(also, sometimes, what?)
ufa, hufa, ofa,	how?	(also, sometimes, why?, or what?)
hofa, houfa		

Here are a few examples of how these words are used in sentence contexts:²²

onti yu si?
("What do you see?")

onti bot?
("... what about?")

u sabi ampang onti mi sa se?
("Do you understand completely what I'm going to say?")

mi no no onti fi...
("I don't know which...")

mi no sa honti bot hofa in kon...
("I don't know anything about how he came...")

uma fi piik fi mi?
 ("Who is to speak for me?")

uma kaal mi?
 ("Who called me?")

na huma kuda du mi dat sonti?
 ("Who could have done that thing to me?")

hofa bot?
 ("What about?")

ufa i tan?
 ("How is he?")

mi no sabi hofa i go
 ("I don't know how it goes.")

Not only are these interrogatives (and relative pronouns) not found in modern Jamaican Creole, but it seems that they have never been documented before for Jamaica, at any period in its history. Anyone acquainted with the Suriname creoles, however, will immediately recognize strong similarities. Parallels for these words from the three major Suriname creoles (Sranan, Ndjuka, Saramaccan) are listed below:²³

	<i>Jamaican Maroon</i>	<i>Sranan</i>	<i>Ndjuka</i>	<i>Saramaccan</i>
what?	onti	san?	san?	andí?
which?	onti?	di, odisi?	ondi?	ondí?
who?	uma	o suma?	sama?	ambé?
how?	ufa?, ofa?	fa?	on fa?	ún fá?

It is interesting to note that in earlier forms of the Suriname creoles, some of the words listed above were even closer to the present-day Jamaican Maroon equivalents. For instance, in 1765, the coastal creole (which was to become what is known as Sranan today) had *oe fasi* (i.e., *u fasi*) for "how," rather than *fa*

(Voorhoeve & Lichtveld 1975: 280); and in 1778, Saramaccan featured *ondi* for “what,” rather than *andí* (Smith 1978: 115; Schuchardt 1914: 93).

Another interesting feature of the Jamaican Maroon “spirit language” is a sort of structural “harmony” between some of the interrogatives and the corresponding general nouns which seem to be related to them in derivation. For instance:

uma?	who?
suma	person, somebody
onti?	what?, which?
sonti	thing, something

A similar derivational process, and a resulting “harmony” between such pairs, seems to have been involved in the formation of the Suriname creoles, as indicated by the following chart:

	<i>Person</i>	<i>Who?</i>	<i>Thing</i>	<i>What?</i>
Jamaican Maroon	suma	uma	sonti	onti
Sranan	suma, sma	o suma, o sma	sani	o sani, o san
Ndjuka	sama	sama	sani, san	sani, san
Saramaccan 1778	sombre	ambeh	sondi	ondi
Modern Saramaccan	sèmbè, sòmbè	ambé	sondí, soní	andí

Here we have some of the strongest evidence pointing to some sort of special relationship between the Jamaican Maroon “spirit language” and the Suriname creoles. Apparently, none of the other English-based Atlantic creoles (including Krio) have any interrogatives even remotely resembling *onti*, *uma*, or *ufa/ofa* (see Hancock 1969: 66–67). Certainly, nothing similar to these is

found in modern basilectal Jamaican Creole; and Cassidy & Le Page (1980) make no mention of such forms occurring in an earlier stage of the language. The only clear parallels, then, come from the Suriname creoles.

Also interesting is the use in the Jamaican Maroon deep creole of a number of personal pronouns which are not characteristic of the normal creole:

- | | |
|------|--|
| o, a | "he, she, it" |
| u, i | "you" |
| am | "him, her, it" (and sometimes, "you," as object) |

In the "spirit language," *o* and *a* appear to be used interchangeably, as do *u* and *i*. These forms sometimes occur alongside the normal creole forms; that is, in possession speech, the forms *or im* are sometimes used instead of *o* and *a*, and *yu* often replaces *u* or *i*. However, the speech of possessed persons seems to show a preference for the special forms listed above. These forms, according to Cassidy & Le Page (1980), are not found in modern Jamaican Creole; and they do not usually occur among the Maroons in normal speech contexts. Parallels can once again be seen in the Suriname creoles; in all three (Sranan, Ndjuka, and Saramaccan), *a* is used (along with alternate forms in each case) to mean "he, she, it," and *i* is used in some contexts to mean "you" (Hancock 1969: 60–61). This is not the case, however, for any of the other major Atlantic creoles.

I) A Comparative Word-List

There follows below a listing of words from the Jamaican Maroon "spirit language" which have close parallels in either Krio or the Suriname creoles. In this list the reader will find, in addition to the words mentioned in the above description, a number of other parallels. By listing these all together in one place, I hope to draw attention to the degree of resemblance which exists between the Jamaican deep creole and these other languages.²⁴

	<i>Jamaican Maroon ("Spirit Language")</i>	<i>Normal Basilectal Jamaican Creole</i>	<i>Sranan</i>	<i>Ndjuka</i>	<i>Saramaccan</i>	<i>Krio</i>
arm/hand	hanu, anu	han, an	anu	ana	máu	an
ask	aksi	aks	aksi	aksi	hákisi, ákisi	aks
be (equating)	na	a, da	na, da	na	da	na
big	bigi	big	bigi	bigi	bígi	big
black	blaka, baka, braka	blak	blaka	baaka	baáka	blak
blood	blada, mblada, bladis	blod	brudu	boodu	buúu	blöd
body, skin	sikin, kin	skin, kin	skin	sikin	sinkii	skin
book	bukun	buk	buku	buku	búku	buk
brother	blada	breda, bra	brada	baala	baáa	bra
buttocks	lasi	raas, ras	lasi		gogo	ras
carry	chai	kya, kya, kyari	tjari	tjai	tjá, tjái	
catch, take	kisā, kisō	kech	kisi	kisi	kisi	ketʃ
child	píkin, píkibo	píkni	píkin	píkin	miíi	píkin
climb	klem, krem	klaim	kreñ	kreñ	subí	klem
come	kō	kom, kong	kōm, kōñ	koñ	kó	kam, kā
country	kondri	konchrí	kondre	konde	köndè (village)	kɔntri
dawn	debrekin, debekrin, debeklin	die kliin	de-brəkə	de-booko		do-klin
dead	dede	ded	dede	dede	dédè	dede
dog	dago	daag, dag	dagu	dago	dágú	dög
fight	fete	fait	feti	feti	feti	fet
food	ninyā	fud	nanjan	ŋajan	njanjá	ŋanjam
give	ji, gi	gi	gi, ji	gi, ji	dá	gi
head	ede	ed, hed	ede	ede	hédi	ed
headscarf	ingkecha	ed tai	anjisa		hángisa	ɛŋkintʃa
hear	arik, harik	yeri, yer	arki	aliki	jéi	jéri
he/she	a, o	im, in, ing	a	a	a	i
hello	odio, hodio	houdi du	ədi	odi	ódi	adu
how	ufa, ofa	hou	fa, o	on fa	ún fá	aw, a
in/at	na	ina, a, da	na	na	na, a	na
kill	kii, ki	kil	kiri	kii	kii	kil
knife	indepe, indufe	naif	nefi	nefi	sémbí-ndéfi (razor)	nef
knock, hit	naki	nak	naki	naki	náki	nak
know	sabi, sa	no, nuo	sabi	sabi, sa	sábi, sá	no, sabi
leg/foot	futu	fut	futu	futu	fútu	fut
live	lib, libis	lib, liv	libi	libi	líbi	lib
look (at)	luku	luk, luku	luku	luku	lúku	luk

	<i>Jamaican Maroon ("Spirit Language")</i>	<i>Normal Basilectal Jamaican Creole</i>	<i>Sranan</i>	<i>Ndjuka</i>	<i>Saramaccan</i>	<i>Krio</i>
make	meke	mek	meki		mbéi	mek
middle	mildri	migl	mindri	mindi	mindi	midul
mouth	mutu, moutu	mout	mofo, boka	mofo	búka	mat
night	net	nait	neti	neti	ndéti	net
person	suma	smadi, smari	sma, suma	sama	sòmbè,	pəsin
pig	hagu	hag	agu	hago	hágu	əg
place	pre, pres	plies	pe, presi	pe	kamia	ples
pleasure, pleased	priis, priiz	pleja, pliiz	prisiri	piisi	piizii	pleʃ
plantation, yard	prandes	yaad	prendasi, pranasi		pandási	
pull	puu	pul	puru	puu	púu	pul
ride	re	raid	re	re	seéi,	red
self	sjref	sef, self	srefi	seefi	seépi	sef
stomach	bere, beri, beli	beli	bere	bee	bèè	bele
swallow	swara	swala	swari	gobe	guli	swela
swear	swiri, sweri	swie, swiir	sweri	sweli	sói	
take	teka	tek	teki	teke	téi	tek
talk	taki	tak, taak	taki	taki	taki	tək
time	tem	'taim	tē	tiŋ	tén	tem
to (locative)	na	a, da	na, a	na, a	na, a	na, to
ugly (evil)	ogri, hogri, ogli	iivl, oglí	ogri	ogii	wógi, ógi	wogri
walk	waka	waak	waka	waka	wáka	waka
what	onti, honti	wa, we	san	sa	andi	wetin
white	wete	wait	weti	weti	wéti	wet
who	uma, huma	hu, huu, u	o suma	sama	ambè	uda
wood, forest	wudu, udu, hudu	wud, hud, ud	udu	udu	údu (wood; mátu = forest)	wud
yam (yam cultivation)	nyās, nyamis	yam, nyam, nyams, nyaams	jamsi		njámisi	ŋams
yonder	anda, yanda	yanda	jana	janda	alá, aá, na andé	janda
you (sing.)	i, yu, u	yu-	ju, i	i, ju	jú, i	ju
young man	nyūman	yong man, nyong man			njúma (sister's son)	
verbal marker (durative)	e, he	a, da, dc	de, e	e	tá	de, di
verbal marker (future)	sa, wi	wi, gwain	sa, go	sa, go	sa, ó	go

THE QUESTION OF PRESERVATION

I have yet to address the question of whether the "spirit language" of the Maroons should be considered an accurate representation of the actual speech of an earlier time. Participants in Kromanti Play have no doubts about this; it is only natural, they say, that the ancestors, when they possess living mediums, should continue to use the form of language which they knew when they were alive.²⁵ But there is little independent evidence to be found in support of this belief. Almost nothing can be stated with certainty about the language of the early Maroons, since the few existing historical documents give so little information.

The two standard passages concerning the language of the early Maroons, by R. C. Dallas and Bryan Edwards, give us little to work with:

The Maroons, in general, speak, like most of the other negroes in the island, a peculiar dialect of English, corrupted with African words; and certainly understand our language sufficiently well to have received instruction in it (Dallas 1803: 92).

Concerning the Maroons, they are in general ignorant of our language ... Their language was a barbarous dissonance of the African dialects, with a mixture of Spanish and broken English (Edwards 1796: xxvii, xxix).

Although these statements conflict with one another in their assessment of the Maroons' competence in the "standard" English of the metropole, their gist is the same. What we can conclude from these accounts is that the Maroons of the eighteenth century spoke some kind of creole language which was lexically largely English-derived, but included also a number of contributions from various African languages. Beyond this, there is little we can say.

Dallas provides an example of what is supposed to be Maroon speech, while discussing polygamy. In the following segment, a Maroon is objecting to the suggestion, made by a Christian who was trying to convert him, that he would have to give up one of his wives.

"Top, Massa Governor," said he, "top lilly bit — you say me mus forsake my wife." — "Only one of them." — "Which dat one? Jesus Christ say so? Gar

a' mighty say so? No, no, massa; Gar a' mighty good; he no tell somebody he mus forsake him wife and children. Somebody no wicked for forsake him wife! No, massa, dis here talk no do for we" (Dallas 1803: 113).

Of course, this can hardly be considered a faithful rendition of the sort of language Maroons used amongst themselves, or even when talking to colonial officials. Nevertheless, this passage suggests that the language heard by Dallas and other British visitors to the Maroons struck these observers as being similar to the language used by slaves on the plantations. The above segment reads much like other attempts by contemporary writers to portray creole speech, either on the plantations or in town. In fact, there is nothing in this passage which is distinguishable from normal slave speech during this period, as recorded (albeit in distorted form) by contemporary authors. Thus, we cannot know whether the Maroons at this time spoke as their primary language a form of creole English which differed little, if at all, from the language of the plantations; or whether they spoke their own distinct form of creole English (alongside the creole of the plantations).²⁶

In any case, the documents from after this period add little to our knowledge of Maroon language, and are of little help in trying to place the "deep" language of possessed Maroons in diachronic perspective.²⁷ We are forced, then, to rely primarily on oral traditions. What they tell us is this: in the not so distant past, within the memory of some living Maroons, people used to talk "deeper" than they do today; in those days, it is said, outsiders could distinguish Maroons from other Jamaicans merely by their speech—which is no longer possible. Although these memories of a once-distinct form of Maroon speech are sometimes invoked in order to explain the speech of possessed Maroons, they are often also discussed independently. Most older Maroons would agree with the following comment, made in passing by a Maroon from Charles Town, then in his seventies; indeed, several older Maroons from all of the communities made similar statements to me.

. . . them [older people] always talk deep. All when me a little bit of boy, them no speak plain like now . . . even without [Kromanti] language, any speaking at all, whether [Kromanti] language or no [Kromanti] language. Because

first time, when you go to Moore Town, you hear them say: "kō ye . . . kō ye, ba" [i.e., as opposed to "kom ya" in normal creole] . . . so them always talk . . . them speak different now, for them get more enlightened now more than in those days.²⁸

These oral traditions are confirmed by C. L. G. Harris, the Colonel of the Moore Town Maroons; in his book (Harris n.d.), he provides many examples of what he claims to be the Maroon speech of an earlier period. (He does not connect these examples explicitly with present-day possession speech.) Colonel Harris' discussion of this earlier form of speech is presented below, at length, for it is of great interest:

It is worthwhile to know that as late as the early 1920's the ordinary speech of some of the older Maroons would not be understood easily by non-Maroons, for though the words used were basically English (with a few genuine Ashanti expressions thrown in here and there) they were so distorted as to render recognition by others extremely difficult if not impossible. Some people hearing this dialect erroneously believed that they were listening to Coromantee (Harris n.d.: 101).

The disguises found so often in many English words used were not deliberate but rather were a natural distortion which gradually became standard speech. Thus *kee*, *poo*, *teh*, meant *kill*, *pull*, *tell*, respectively. *Nhumawn* (the first syllable is very short) meant *youngman*. But some words and combinations of words are difficult to assess although their meanings are clear to the Maroon. Consider the question, *na hunty yu cohn yeh fi?* Here *yu*, *yeh*, *fi* are readily identifiable as *you*, *here*, and *for* respectively; and *cohn*, because of its sound and position among the others presents no difficulty in being recognized as *come*. However, *na* and *hunty* present a different picture: the meaning of the former is *is*, and of the latter, *what*; therefore their combination can mean *is what* as well as *why*; so the question literally is, *is what you come here for?* (why do you come here?) (Harris n.d.: 105).²⁹

It is clear that all of the examples of an earlier form of speech offered by Colonel Harris above are found still in the speech of possessed Maroons. When all of the evidence is tied together, then, there can be little doubt as to the status of the Maroon "spirit language." Although it should not be considered a fully-preserved, static replica of an earlier language form, it seems certain that many of its distinctive elements hark back to an old layer of creole which was once spoken by Maroons in ordinary contexts. Today it lives on only in the voices of the ancestors who come to visit Kromanti Play.

HISTORICAL QUESTIONS

If we accept that the distinctive characteristics of the Maroon “spirit language” outlined above represent survivals from an earlier form of creole once used in ordinary contexts — and there is every reason to believe this, as I have shown — then a number of further questions emerge. What implications, we might ask, does the existence of this “deep” creole have for our understanding of the language history of Jamaica?

For one thing, the data presented in this paper add further support to decreolization theory in general. It would be difficult to interpret the Maroon “spirit language” as anything other than a partially non-decreolized language-form from an earlier time which has been preserved (though not totally without change) in ceremonial contexts. What this might tell us about the more general developmental history of Jamaican Creole, however, is open to argument. Do we have here definitive evidence that there once existed on the Jamaican plantations a form of English-based creole quite different from (i.e., “deeper” than) the basilectal varieties found throughout the island today — a form which was carried into the bush and preserved by Maroons?³⁰ Or should the Maroon “spirit language” be considered the present-day remnant of a special form of creole developed independently by the Maroons, and historically limited, for the most part, to their own communities?

Whichever of these interpretations one might favor, the remarkable similarities between the Jamaican Maroon “spirit language” and the creoles of both Suriname and Sierra Leone still require explanation. Once again, the available data allow us to arrive at no final answers. On the one hand, the parallels between the Jamaican Maroon deep creole and a number of other creoles geographically far-removed from it might be seen as some of the strongest evidence yet presented that a common substratum underlies all of the Atlantic creoles.³¹ It would be difficult to account for the specificity and the sheer number of these parallels without positing the existence of such a substrate. On the other hand, the picture is complicated by the fact that there are well-documented and important direct historical connections between Jamaica and both Suriname and Sierra Leone.

In 1667 the colony of Suriname was taken from the English by the Dutch. Although the new Dutch governor attempted to keep as many of the original British settlers as possible in the colony, most of them ended up leaving, along with their slaves, by the year 1680. A sizeable number chose Antigua as their destination, but the majority sailed for Jamaica. There is no way of knowing the exact numbers of those who resettled in Jamaica, but existing documents allow us to say that *at least* 1748 persons from Suriname made Jamaica their new home during the 1670's (517 arrived in 1671, and another 1231 in 1675). Of this number, we can say with certainty that at least 981 were slaves (although the actual number of slaves was probably considerably higher).³²

It must be kept in mind that at the time when this migration took place, Jamaica was still a fledgling English colony. The English had been there only since 1655, and the plantation system was still very young. When the Suriname immigrants came on the scene, the population of slaves already there was both small and relatively new to the island (in 1673, the slave population was around 9,500, meaning that by 1675, slaves of Surinamese origin constituted roughly one-tenth of the total slave population — if not more).³³ Coming as they did on the eve of an explosion of new slave imports, the Suriname immigrants entered the picture — linguistically-speaking — at a critical time; for the original Jamaican pidgin/creole linguistic base which was to serve as a model for the thousands of African slaves who poured into the island in the following decades must have still been in the process of formation.³⁴ That the newly-arrived slaves from Suriname contributed to this process seems more than likely.³⁵

There is yet further evidence pointing in this direction. It is known that the Suriname immigrants became spread out over a wide area soon after entering Jamaica. Although a large number of the smaller settlers gravitated to a single locale in the western part of the island (which was known as the "Suriname Quarters"), those who possessed the means — and thus also the largest number of slaves — purchased large tracts of land and started plantations in several different parishes, including St. Catherine, St. Dorothy, St. Elizabeth, Vere, Clarendon, and St. George (Cundall 1919: 153–172). We know, therefore, that many of the

slaves of Surinamese origin were kept together and shared the same plantations in Jamaica; but at the same time, their main concentrations were spread across several different areas. This would mean that the already-existing shared creole base (i.e., cultural and linguistic) brought by the Surinamese slaves could have been maintained in a communal setting; and it can be surmised that the Surinamese influence might have radiated out from these centers of concentration so as to affect the larger population. Although nothing is known about the extent to which slaves of Surinamese origin were involved in marronage, clearly their numbers and geographic distribution were such that we cannot rule out the possibility that they had a significant linguistic impact in the island as a whole, and in the early Maroon communities in particular. Whether this fact in itself will suffice as an explanation for the striking parallels between the Jamaican Maroon "spirit language" and the present-day Suriname creoles is a matter for further argument.

As for the parallels with Krio, the creole of Sierra Leone, it is well known that an entire community of Jamaican Maroons, numbering nearly six hundred, was transported to Freetown in 1800, and some linguists believe that the language they brought with them played an important part in the formation of Krio.³⁶ It should be noted, however, that whereas the Maroons who were sent to Sierra Leone came from the western part of Jamaica, the Maroons who provided the data for this paper all belong to the eastern communities, and their ceremonial tradition differs considerably from that found in the surviving western community of Accompong. Whether the Accompong Maroons (who formed the "sister" community of the Maroons who were transported to Sierra Leone) now possess, or have ever possessed, a distinctive "spirit language" comparable to that of the eastern communities, I do not know. But it is known, in any case, that the eastern and western communities were not completely isolated from one another in the past, and they still display a number of cultural similarities.

It is difficult to disentangle all of these historical threads, and thus it is not possible to arrive at any sort of firm conclusion. While the close relationship of the "deep" creole of the Jamaican

Maroons to Krio and the Suriname creoles may have to do primarily with ultimate common ancestry (i.e., the shared substratum), a more direct, linear (or rather, "triangular") connection through time (via the early migration from Suriname to Jamaica and, subsequently, that from Jamaica to Sierra Leone) cannot be ruled out. Further research, as well as future archival discoveries, may well tip the balance one way or the other. Whatever the case may be, the implications are intriguing, for it becomes apparent that the Jamaican Maroon "spirit language" has provided us with a special kind of entrée into the past. It is to be hoped that esoteric cult and possession languages in other parts of Afro-America will become the subject of careful study in the future, for if the Jamaican Maroon case is an accurate indicator, it would seem that a valuable new dimension could thereby be opened for creole studies.

NOTES

1. For basic background information on the Jamaican Maroons, see Dallas (1803), Kopytoff (1973), Patterson (1970), Williams (1938). For a general look at Maroon societies throughout the Americas, see Price (1979).

Rebecca Bateman, Ian Hancock, Richard Price and Sally Price were kind enough to read and comment on an earlier version of this paper. I would like to thank them for their encouragement and helpful suggestions. I am also grateful to Bonno Thoden van Velzen for his help with Ndjuka, which allowed me to see a number of important connections, and to Joseph G. Moore for his generosity in giving me access to his field materials.

2. Le Page (1960: 102) has stated that "the Creole English of the Maroons preserves a higher proportion of Twi loan-words than is current in other parts of the island." At any rate, the data he presents in his volume come almost completely from the western community of Accompong, and the samples of transcribed speech he offers do not differ significantly from the sort of creole spoken throughout the island; in other words, they do not convey an impression of particular conservatism. The data from the eastern Maroons presented in the present paper, however, do bear out the claims of Cassidy and Le Page, in unambiguous fashion, as I show below.

3. For a detailed description of Kromanti Play based on this fieldwork, see Bilby (1981). The data included in the present study comes from all three of the eastern (Windward) Maroon communities — Moore Town, Charles Town, and Scott's Hall. The bulk of the material comes from Moore Town, where I spent the longest time (twelve months), but there is a significant amount from the other two as well. Since the "spirit languages" of the three communities are very

similar, I have not indicated specific provenience for the items discussed in the main text. Those items which appear to be peculiar to one town or another can be seen in the word-lists offered in Appendix C, in which the lexical data used in the main text are broken down by community (along with a number of additional items not discussed in the main text).

The field research upon which this study is based was later supplemented by archival research at the Public Records Office in London, during September 1982; a few relevant passages from original historical documents in the P.R.O. collections have been incorporated in this paper.

4. Cassidy & Le Page (1980: lv) mention an "archaic specimen" of Jamaican Creole known as "Bungo talk" — a type of speech found in small pockets of the island, which is supposed to be the very most basilectal form. Akers (1981: 74) also refers to "Bungo talk," and places it at the very base of the Jamaican continuum. Judging from these authors' descriptions, the differences between "Bungo talk" and normal basilectal Jamaican Creole are very slight when compared to the differences between the Maroon "spirit language" and the normal creole. Furthermore, these two archaic forms of creole ("Bungo talk" and Maroon "spirit language") do not differ from the normal basilectal creole in the same ways; each form displays its own distinguishing features.

5. For a brief description of the Kromanti language of the Jamaican Maroons, see Dalby (1971). See also Bilby (1981) and Hall-Alleyne (1982).

I am presently at work on a forthcoming paper directly concerned with the Maroon Kromanti language, which is separate from the "spirit language" described in the present paper.

6. I am not a linguist by training; however, the nature of my fieldwork was such that I was in a unique position to gather linguistic material which is not normally easily accessible to outsiders. Hence, I spent a good deal of time and effort on the collection of such materials.

7. Most Maroons insist that possession by the most ancient ancestors is very rare, and dangerous to the medium, but it does occur nonetheless. See Bilby (1981: 57).

8. This means that the more recently deceased an ancestor, the more intelligible his speech is supposed to be to the living — not only because it includes fewer Kromanti expressions, but also because of differences in pronunciation, speed and style of delivery, and so forth. This is supposed to mean as well that the ancestors who come to possess dancers at Kromanti Play can be chronologically placed, in relative terms, by their speech. In practice, however, such placement is difficult, for there appears to be a built-in "ceiling" on the speech of the ancestors; that is, even the most recently deceased Maroons (those who have died, say, in the last ten years) apparently "revert" to a deeper form of speech when they enter the world of the ancestors. Thus, the spirits of a Maroon who died ten years ago and one who died a hundred years ago will use essentially the same form of "deep" language when they come to possess the living.

9. The magnetic power of Kromanti (which is independent of any semantic load) was explained to me by one ritual specialist (*sete-man*) as follows: "... when

you talk the [Kromanti] language, it coming from way back, from olden days. So that power now come up and those man, older man, older man, older man, come up to that language, when you talk that language . . . and hold you fast, and help you fe push that power. When you use the language, it come same like a song. When you sing a song, a olden song, same way you call a olden man, old-time man, from way back . . . from *way* back too!" (Transcribed directly from tape-recorded conversation.)

10. It is interesting to compare how the Saramaka Maroons of Suriname conceptualize their language: "The Saramaka believe that language is a multi-layered phenomenon. The several labels for any particular object are scaled from more to less intimately associated, in a spiritual sense, with the thing they stand for. Those labels whose bond to their referents is most sacred are termed *gaán nē* ("true" or "big" names); these epitomize the essence of a thing, are considered private, must be used with circumspection, and include a relatively high proportion of terms derived from African languages. On a more general level, the Saramaka believe that their language, including the various layers, is not the "real" Saramaka language, which was more heavily grounded in reality but was lost in the distant past, and that what passes for the Saramaka language today was learned from forest spirits (*apíku*) at the time the original rebels established their first independent communities" (Price & Price 1972: 342).

11. For a discussion of Maroon secrecy, and a description of the ritual oath, see Bilby (1981: 76–80). This oath is strictly adhered to only in Moore Town. The other two communities were more relaxed about recording during episodes of possession.

12. Although I saw this manuscript while still in the field, I did not read the sections on language at that time, and thus my collection of data and my early interpretations were not influenced by the Colonel's comments. I would like to take this opportunity to offer my sincere thanks to Colonel Harris for making his manuscript available to me after I returned from the field.

13. All items from the Jamaican Maroon "spirit language" are rendered throughout this paper according to the phonemic orthography for Jamaican Creole used by Cassidy & Le Page (1980: xxxix–xl). Two exceptions are made, for sounds which occur in the "spirit language" but are uncommon or non-existent in normal Jamaican Creole: "sj," and "˜" (these symbols are explained below).

Professor Ian Hancock (pers. comm., Feb., 1983) has pointed out to me that epithesis may be a retained feature rather than all of the individual forms being retained forms; that is, of the examples listed here, some may represent "standard" Jamaican Creole forms which have been "deepened" by acquiring a final vowel, while others probably have had and continue to have fixed forms. My data indicate that this is indeed the case, and I remember the occasional adding of final vowels to words (not listed here) which were most commonly pronounced, even in possession speech, without them.

14. "Blada" and "debeklin" are variants of the more common forms, "brada" and "debrekin."

Professor Hancock (pers. comm., Feb., 1983) has noted that it is possible that

the less common form, "debeklin," is derived from "de-be(n)-klin" rather than "day-breaking." Krio (Sierra Leone) has "de-don-klin" and normal Jamaican Creole has "die-kliin."

15. Akers (1981), in his discussion of /r/-distribution in modern Jamaican Creole, makes no mention of the /l/ ~ /r/ variation which is found in the Maroon "spirit language."

In the "spirit language," it should be noted, /r/ is never a trill or flap (as it is, for instance, in Sranan), but is pronounced as a semi-vowel. (It appears that it is a retroflexed vowel glide similar to /r/ in most dialects of American English, although occasionally it goes almost to a "w".) It is interesting to note, however, that when I made a brief visit to the western (Leeward) community of Accompong in 1978 I heard a flapped /r/ in normal Maroon speech there; this seemed to be absent in Maroon speech (whether normal or "deep") in the three Windward communities.

16. In this paper, "sj" is used to represent a sound which occurs in the "spirit language" but not in normal Jamaican Creole. It is a groove fricative somewhat similar to [š], articulated near the back of the teeth ridge with the front of the tongue. A similar groove fricative has been described for Gullah (see Alleyne 1980: 59–60).

Among the Windward Maroons, the greeting "yengkungku?", meaning "are you a Maroon?", is properly answered with "sjref-sjref" (i.e., self-self), meaning roughly, "yes, same as you." This is the same expression noted by Moore (1953: 277) as "shref-shref," although one of Moore's informants erroneously glossed the expression as "spirit." This error made its way eventually into Cassidy and Le Page (1980: 407).

17. In basilectal Jamaican Creole, "bottle" is *bakl*; in this case, it seems that *baklbwai* became *blakabwai*. It should be mentioned that *pripri* is sometimes, though not often, pronounced /pripril/ or /priprl/.

18. In this paper, vowels nasalized in this way feature the symbol " ~": ã, ē, ī, õ, ū. (The symbol is the same as that used in I.P.A. orthography.)

19. The following examples are all taken from transcriptions of tape-recordings.

20. Hancock (1969: 68) has noted that in each case of a creole language featuring particles which function in these ways, "the verbal form is identical with the locative prepositional form." Note that this holds true for the Maroon "spirit language" (in which *na* can be either verbal or locative), as well as normal Jamaican Creole (in which *a/da* can be either verbal or locative).

21. Schafer (1973: 251) heard an expression "ontiffi!" in Scott's Hall, which was glossed for him as "watch out!" In Moore Town "onti fi!" can be used in a similar way as an exclamation, although something like "what's there?!" would be a more accurate gloss.

22. The following examples are taken from transcribed tape recordings.

23. Jamaican words are rendered according to the phonemic orthography used

by Cassidy & Le Page (1980). All other words (except Saramaccan) are rendered according to a loose approximation of I.P.A. orthography. (A Jamaican exception is "sj," as noted above.) For Saramaccan, the phonemic orthography first proposed by Voorhoeve (1959) is used.

The closest thing Krio has to any of the interrogatives listed here is *wətin* or *wetin* ("what thing"), which bears some slight resemblance to Jamaican Maroon *onti*; otherwise there are no explicit parallels from Sierra Leone.

24. The first paragraph of note 23 also applies for the following word-list.

25. Although the speech of possessed Maroons is conceptualized as the way the possessing spirit used to talk when alive, everyone knows that the spirit of a Maroon who died in 1977 (and who thus spoke modern creole while alive) will use the same "deep" language as other spirits when possessing people at Kromanti Play. This creates no logical conflict; it is not analyzed, and is simply part of "the way things are" (see note 8).

Although the more recently-deceased ancestors all use the same form of "deep" language, the really older ones — those who are said to have lived, for instance, during the time of war or shortly after — do in fact use more Kromanti expressions, and their speech may vary in other ways as well; I do not have sufficient data to elaborate further on this.

26. There are several other historical documents — dealing with the pre-treaty Maroons — which contain suggestive references to language. All of these indicate that the Maroons spoke *some* form of English. One such document, a letter of 1732, makes reference to a captured Maroon "woman who was born in one of the Rebellious Settlements and speaks good English" (Public Records Office, London, C.O. 137: 20, No. 154). In another document — the confession of a slave held in 1733 for corresponding with the Maroons — a slave in conversation with a Maroon is quoted as having addressed the latter as follows: "Master use's us goodee yet, but when him use us ugly we'll come" (Public Records Office, C.O. 137: 20, No. 179). In yet another account of an encounter with the Maroons, a British officer writes of Captain Quao (or "Quoha") of the Windward Maroons that "he spoke tolerable good English," and goes on to provide a rather poignant sample of his speech: "massa you no see this hole in my cheek? one of your shot bounce again my gun, him fly (sic) up, and makeum" (Thickness 1788: 124). Other examples similar to these could be provided, showing that the early Maroons had a good grasp of plantation creole; but to my knowledge there exists no document which will allow us to say whether or not the pre-treaty Maroons commanded, *in addition to* the shared creole of the plantations, a form of English-based creole distinguishable as their own.

For an interesting discussion of language among the early Maroons, see Kopytoff (1973: 22–27). See also Hall-Alleyne (1982: 25–26).

27. Certain Maroon words given to Williams (1938) in the 1930's can be recognized as words still used in the "spirit language" today. Before this work, there is virtually no reliable documentation of Maroon language that I know of. The words collected by Williams (*ibid.*: 464–6) which I heard used during episodes of possession are as follows (each word or phrase collected by Williams is followed in parentheses by the corresponding word and gloss collected by myself in one or more of the Windward communities):

From Accompong Town: “*hundad hand, banana*” (hondad han, banana bunch); “*bring-mi cojoe, walking-stick*” (kojo, walking stick); “*cojoe, cocoa*” (konjo, St. Vincent yam); “*a-kete, war bugle*” (akete, signalling horn). From Moore Town: “*tokono midasim*, the man who looks salt is not the man who eats it” (midasem, salt). From Charles Town: “*mut, mouth*” (mutu, mouth); “*tesu, stand up*” (tesu, stand up); “*insho, water*” (isho, water); “*insa, rum*” (isa, rum); “*incheswa, egg*” (ingkeswa, egg); “*incucko, fowl*” (inkoko, fowl); “*timbambo, fire*” (timbambo, fire); “*deppa, knife*” (indepe, knife); “*plantdice, field*” (prandes, yard or grounds); “*sably memhone, puss*” (salimiou, cat); “*cubbity, good night*” (kubaiti, goodbye); “*kaekra, Maroon bugle*” (akrekre, signalling horn). And finally, from Scott’s Hall: “*opprosoa, woman*” (opreswa, woman); “*awissa, pepper*” (awisa, pepper); “*ensemexray, sugar*” (insikri, sugar and water); “*cojo topo, top of a tree*”— note the final vowel on “top” recorded by Williams (kojo, tree); “*duchengray, rope*” (dosenggri, rope); “*caban, house*” (kaban, house).

I am able to offer here further valuable comparative data, collected more than thirty years ago. The following items, and the corresponding glosses, have been taken off a tape of an interview conducted by the anthropologist Joseph Moore in St. Thomas parish in 1950. The interview was with a part-Maroon herbalist who had relatives in the Moore Town area. I have transcribed the items directly from this tape, which Dr. Moore was kind enough to make available to me. For further background on Dr. Moore’s fieldwork in Jamaica, see Moore (1953). The “Maroon language” elicited by Dr. Moore on this tape is as follows: “*bére, belly*”; “*bigi išhó, the sea*”; “*debréki, yesterday*”; “*gángfrara, ancestor spirit*”; “*išho bríbri, rain or water falling*”; “*jákisa, a drink*”; “*kubáiti, goodbye*”; “*ónti, where*”; “*ónti da júman bin?*, where has he been to?”, “*sjref, self*”; “*sómti, something*”; “*tajína, to talk*”; “*wáka, to walk*.”

28. Taken from a transcription of a tape-recording.

29. The Colonel uses the cluster “nh/hn” loosely to represent the sort of vowel nasalization which I indicate with “~”. Thus, “*cohn*” equals “*kō*,” and “*nhumawn*” equals “*nyūman*.”

30. Alleyne (1980: 189) states: “even the basic creole dialect of Jamaica... may... be considered an instance of decreolization because the contemporary form is much closer to standard English than its 17th-, 18th-, and 19th-century forms.” The question is, just *how* different were these earlier forms from modern creole, and in what ways? — in the same ways that the Maroon “spirit language” differs from the normal creole?

For an interesting linguistic analysis of an early nineteenth-century Jamaican song, based on several surviving texts, see Lalla (1981). Although Lalla used the texts to show how the Jamaican Creole of the early nineteenth century differed from the modern version, the differences she points out are very slight when compared to those between the Maroon “spirit language” and modern basilectal Jamaican Creole. None of the several peculiar features of the “spirit language” which appear to be completely absent in present-day Jamaican Creole turn up in the song texts, although Lalla (*ibid*: 25) does mention one feature which is a rarity in the modern basilect but is quite common in the Maroon “spirit language”: namely, “the variation between [r] and [l] evidenced in the textual variation swallow... swarra.”

A useful general discussion of how written texts from the past can be used to

gain insights into earlier forms of creole can be found in Lalla (1979). For a good discussion of the creole continuum found in present-day Jamaica, see Hall-Alleyne (1980).

The objection might be raised, in response to the theory of a once more widespread "deeper" form of creole, that there appears to be no trace today of this "deep" form (i.e., with Maroon features) in any parts of Jamaica other than Maroon areas; one would like to find *some* evidence elsewhere, but none has yet been uncovered. However, this might not be such a coincidence. After all, according to older Maroons, the archaic features of possession speech have not been a part of normal Maroon speech since the 1920's or earlier. Such features could have once existed in other parts of the island and over time, as in Moore Town, disappeared from normal speech. Perhaps the only reason these "deep" features still exist in Moore Town (and the other Windward towns) is that these communities have well-integrated, closed ceremonial complexes in which this kind of speech plays an integral part. It seems that non-Maroon Jamaican areas, with few exceptions, have in recent times lacked ceremonial traditions comparable to Kromanti Play, which might have served the same sort of preservative function. (Many Maroons under age 60 or so — those who have never attended Kromanti Play, for religious or other reasons — do not even know that such a deep language exists!)

I try in the final section of this paper to begin to take into account some of the general socio-historical considerations raised by Sidney Mintz (1971), with whom I fully agree about the need for careful historical contextualization in creole linguistic studies. However, in a paper of this length, justice cannot be done to the complexities of the sociolinguistic situation in Jamaica during the years when the Surinamers arrived. I offer here but a few broad suggestions, based on my interpretation of the available demographic data. Much work remains to be done in this area.

31. Among the several competing theories which have been put forth to explain the many parallels between the Atlantic (and other) creoles are those which postulate polygenesis (parallels between creoles being attributed to universal processes involved in contact between languages); and those which postulate monogenesis in an original pidgin or creole substrate language which, after undergoing relexification and decreolization, developed into the different varieties of creole languages found today. The latter position is clearly set out in Whinnom (1965) and, from a different perspective, Voorhoeve (1973). Alleyne (1980) seems to support the idea of an original substrate, but opposes the monogenetic relexification theory, postulating instead the existence of a common *general African-based* substrate which has been modified over time through acculturation processes. The monogenesis/polygenesis debate has yet to be resolved. (See DeCamp 1977: 13–16).

Ian Hancock (personal communication, February, 1983) offers the hypothesis that the Jamaican Maroon "deep" creole and the Suriname creoles both represent surviving forms derived from "Guinea Coast Creole English," a "domestic, household, ethnic" language which became established along the mouth of the Gambia River and in the Nigeria-Cameroon border area some time between 1580 and 1630. In contrast to these forms, Professor Hancock suggests, most of the other English-derived creoles spoken in the West Indies might be derived from a more anglicized, general lingua franca which developed along the West African coast at a later point, and which did not reach the New World

until after the "deeper," more African creole had already become firmly established in a few areas (such as Suriname, and parts of Jamaica). The subtler intricacies of Professor Hancock's argument cannot be presented here, but the reader will find a clear exposition of the "domestic origin hypothesis" on which it is based in Hancock (1972).

32. These figures are taken from Cundall (1919), which remains the most thorough published account of the migration from Suriname to Jamaica. Several later writers have provided figures which agree with these, including Bridenbaugh & Bridenbaugh (1972: 218), Hancock (1969: 14), Le Page (1960: 17), and Voorhoeve & Lichtveld (1975: 275). The migration of 1671 is documented in the *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies*, Vol. 7 (1669-1674): in a letter of January 16, 1672 (No. 734), it is stated that two ships from Suriname had arrived in Jamaica carrying a total of "517 persons" (including "105 families"); unfortunately, the letter does not indicate how many of these passengers, if any, were slaves. The later migration of 1675 is also documented in the *Calendar of State Papers*, same series, Vol. 9 (No. 932), where all the "Christians" who made the journey are listed by name, followed by the number of slaves owned by each (the total number of slaves is 981, 31 of these being listed as "Indians" rather than "Negroes"). A more complete list, including the names of most of the 981 slaves who were brought from Suriname to Jamaica at this time, can be found in a copy of a letter of September 22, 1675, which has been preserved in the Public Records Office in London (C.O. 278: 3, Nos. 119-135).

33. The figure of 9,500 slaves for 1673 is based on the estimates of Curtin (1969: 59) and Dunn (1972: 155); it should be seen as a rough estimate, since the combination of primary and secondary sources consulted by these two authors cannot be considered completely reliable (as they themselves note). Professors Michael Craton and Barry Higman have both indicated to me in personal communications that the period under consideration is open to much more detailed demographic work. The figures put forth in this paper, thus, may eventually need revision as more detailed data from archival sources comes to light.

34. The initial years of British colonization and slave-importation — during which the Suriname immigrants happened to arrive — appear all the more crucial to the development of Jamaican Creole, when one considers what recent work has shown about the history of Sranan, the present-day English-based creole of Suriname: namely, that it developed with astonishing rapidity, taking its basic form within the colony's first two decades (Price 1976: 20; Voorhoeve 1971: 307. See also Mintz 1971: 491-494.)

It should be noted also that the arrival of the Surinamers coincided with the early growth of the Windward Maroon groups (the western, or "Leeward," Maroons appear to have formed their major settlements at a later point, after the important rebellion of 1690 in Clarendon). The Spanish Maroons remaining behind after the British occupation continued to hide out in the Blue Mountains, and new escapees began to flee to the eastern interior almost as soon as the British began to import slaves. By 1665, these various eastern groups were already active enough to cause the British colonists great consternation, and their numbers steadily increased in the following decades.

35. A few further figures might help to put things in perspective. As late as 1661 — according to a letter (No. 204) summarized in the Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, Vol 5 (1661–1668) — the total number of “negroes” in Jamaica was only 514. Not quite ten years later, in 1670, it was estimated that the total slave population was 2,500 (C.S.P., same series, Vol. 7 [1669–1674], No. 144). It is easy to see, thus, that the arrival of the Suriname immigrants coincided with a rapid influx of *new* slaves into the island. According to yet another letter (C.S.P., same series, Vol. 10 [1677–1680], No. 945), a total of 11,816 slaves were imported into Jamaica between June 25, 1671 and March 25, 1679. Of these, nearly three-fourths came from Africa (“Guinea”), while the remaining quarter were from Suriname (as part of the migrations discussed above) and the Lesser Antilles (Dunn 1972: 157). These figures make it apparent that once the slaves from Suriname had been resettled, they must have represented a rather substantial proportion of the minority of already-creolized (or partially-creolized) slaves who worked alongside, and doubtless influenced, the swelling population of newly-imported Africans in Jamaica. By 1703, the slave population had already grown to roughly 45,000 (Curtin 1969: 59).

36. For background on the Maroon rebellion of 1795–6, which led to the deportation of the entire community of Trelawny Town Maroons from the western part of the island, see Furness (1965).

See Hancock (1969: 9; 30) for a few brief comments on the role of the speech of the Jamaican Maroons (which he believes to have been overestimated by earlier writers) in the development of Krio in Sierra Leone. For a more recent and detailed outlining of his objections to the hypothesis of predominant Jamaican influence in Krio, see Hancock (1981: 247–248).

APPENDIX A

TRANSCRIPTION OF SEGMENT OF TAPED DEMONSTRATION OF MAROON “SPIRIT

LANGUAGE”

(Recorded in Moore Town, October 26, 1978)

im a go se: “nyūman! arik mi guduſa. wī yu min de waka na da pre an yu si dat santi. . . man, dat santi, uſa? i ſabi. . . onti o luku na yu? . . . arik mi gudu! if mi no min bin na da pre, ku ſuma o na yarifo na yu. bika diſya pre we yu waka, a no gudu pre. ſumte tere nait, wen di ſuma kō na pre, den ſuma waka o pas anda pre, ſuma o pas anda pre, o kisō dat santi ſo, chai dat santi ſo, put na da santi na yu no. o ſhala, ſe wel den, dat santi o no tan gudu. . . wen u luku na u ſjref, u ſabi ſe da santi a no gudu santi. yu a go ſe, ‘ha’ . . . luku na ſjref. . . yu ſe ‘hufa bot? . . . ogri! i na ogri ſanti. o. . . o ſanti o kō frā ſali wata, ſe o wo kō frā ſali wata o naki mi laſi.’ ſo u ſabi ampang onti mi ſa ſe?” dat a yu nou. di ada wan ſe. . . yu ſe, “iis.” yu nou ſe, “iis.” . . . in ſe, “arik, onti u bin?” yu ſe, “mi bin a legonan.” in ſe, “arik! tere, wī yu bin da na pre, da ſuma kir wan ſanti. ſo wen da ſuma teka dat na onti, yu min priis?” yu a go ſe, “onti bat?” yu ſe, “onti bat?” dat a yu nou. yu a go aks in ſe nou, ſe, “grāfa, onti bat?” . . . yu a go ſe, “grāfa, honti bot.” im a go ſe. . . im a go taak tu yu nou, yu nuo, ka di guos a go taak tu yu nou. . . im a go ſe, “wī yu min a dat ſotin pre, yu bin na tuakwantan, na yu bin na legonanan, na yu bin na iſho

bere" . . . wen im se 'isho bere,' im miin tu se, yu min a daiv, an yu kom op bak. . . wen im se 'isho bere,' . . . dat miin se yu daiv dong ina wata, yu no. . . wen di guos se 'isho bere,' wen im se 'isho bere,' dat miin se onda wata yu daivin an yu kom op. . . dat miin se yu a bied, an yu daiv, an yu kom op bak, an kal yu fren. . . him kal tu yu an se, "hou di wata luk onda de tu yu?" yu se, "bwai, it luk difren, yu no." so di guos nou a go aks dat kweschan, "yu no min bin na da sotin pre, na 'isho?" yu se, "yiis." dat taim yu a go se, "yis, grāfa" . . . di guos a go taak tu yu nou. im a go se, "win. . . na yu no bin nā 'isho bere?" yu se, "yiis, grāfa." im se dan, "wī yu bin na 'isho bere, yu no si sotin sonti?!" dat miin, wen im se 'sotin sonti' nou, yu a go no se, wel, im miin se di stuon. . . ifim se 'sotin sonti' . . . bika a so guos gen kaal i, im a go se 'sotin sonti.' dat miin se, yu min si wan stuon, or yu min si bambu trii, ar yu si wan sintin. . . yu se, "yis, grāfa." da miin se. . . a grāfa im niem. das it.

TRANSLATION

He is going to say: "Man! Listen to me carefully. When you were walking at that place, and you saw that thing. . . man, that thing, how? Do you know. . . who was looking at you? . . . listen to me good! If I hadn't been at that place, a person could have hurt you. Because this place where you walked, it is not a good place. Sometime tonight (today-night), when the person came to the place, then the person walked and passed that place, the person passed that place, he took that thing so, carried that thing so, put that thing by you now. O shala (?), say well then, that thing was not good. . . when you looked at yourself, you knew that that thing was not a good thing. You are going to say, 'ha!' . . . look at yourself. . . you said, 'what is it about? . . . evil! It is an evil thing. It. . . the thing came from the sea, it came from the sea and hit my ass.' So do you understand completely what I'm going to say?" That is you now. The other one says. . . you say, "yes." You now say, "yes." . . . he says, "listen, where have you been?" You say, "I've been to a distant place." He says, "listen! Today, when you were at that place, that person prepared a thing. So when that person took that there, were you pleased?" You are going to say, "what about?" You say, "what about?" That is you now. You are going to ask him now, "Grandfather, what about?" . . . you are going to say, "Grandfather, what about." He is going to say. . . he is going to talk to you now, you know, because the ghost is going to talk to you now. . . he is going to say, "when you were at that particular place, you were at the crossroads, you were at a distant place, you were under water" ('isho bere) . . . when he says 'isho bere,' he means to say, you were diving, and you came back up. . . when he says 'isho bere' . . . that means that you dove down into the water, you know. . . when the ghost says 'isho bere,' when he says 'isho bere,' that means that you were diving under water and you came up. . . that means that you were bathing, and you dove, and you came back up, and called your friend. . . he called to you and said, "how does the water look under there to you?" You said, "boy, it looks different, you know." So the ghost now is going to ask that question, "weren't you at that particular place, at the water?" You say, "yes." At that time you are going to say, "yes, Grandfather" . . . the ghost is going to talk to you now. He is going to say, "when. . . weren't you under the water?" You say, "yes, Grandfather." He says then, "when you were under water, didn't you see a particular thing?!" ('sotin sonti). That means, when he says 'sotin sonti' now, you are going to know that, well, he means the stone. . . if he says 'sotin sonti' . . .

because that is what the ghost is going to call it, he is going to say 'sotin sonti.' That means that, you saw a stone, or you saw a bamboo tree, or you saw something. . . you say, "yes, Grandfather." That means that. . . he is named Grandfather. That's it.

APPENDIX B

TRANSCRIPTION OF A TAPED SPEECH TO AN ANCESTOR, DURING POURING OF LIBATIONS (Recorded in Scott's Hall, April, 1978)

yes, bigi suma, da nyūman ya bin fram big īsho, bin fram abrouni, bot afā im bin a yangkungku pre, grāfa, da man de a manis. grāfa, di nyūman a manis. wi tuk tek na im na wi kaban. grāfa, wi tuk tek na wi kaban tel i about yangkungku santi. bot grāfa, im a bin bak di taim. im a bin bak frā ī uon prandes an ī uon kaban. an di man tuajina mi, ontī taim in bin bak. . . ī wi bin bak kushu toun. so grāfa, in se in wi bin bak. mi no no ontī fi, if'da man a tel lais, a im a taak truis, bot wi tek wa in se. if im a tel lais, wen im bin bak wi de go go na in sikin. if in no tel lais, wen in bin bak, wi al se, "wiakwamba, wiakwamba, wiakwamba, denko na mi fremili. . . wiakwamba, wiakwamba, grāfa shukumse."

TRANSLATION

Yes, old one, this man came from (across) the sea, came from outside, but after he came to the Maroon place, Grandfather, that man is (showed himself to be) a man. Grandfather, the man is a man. We took him into our home. Grandfather, we took him into our home and told him about Maroon things. But Grandfather, he is coming back sometime. He is coming back from his own yard and his own house. And the man told me (privately), when (which time) he would come back. . . he will come back to Kushu Town (i.e., Scott's Hall). So Grandfather, he said he will come back. I don't know which, if the man is telling lies, or he is talking the truth, but we took what he said. If he is telling lies, when he comes back we will go to his body. If he didn't tell lies, when he comes back, we will all say, "wiakwamba, wiakwamba, wiakwamba, denko na mi fremili. . . wiakwamba, wiakwamba, Grandfather Shukumse" (Kromanti language).

APPENDIX C

LIST OF WORDS COMMONLY FOUND IN POSSESSION SPEECH

Items are divided by town of provenience. In those cases in which alternate forms are listed (e.g., wúdu/údu/húdu/wúdi), the most common form is given first, and the least common appears last. Words are rendered according to the phonemic orthography of Cassidy and Le Page (1980). (Exceptions: "～" equals vowel nasalization; "sj" equals a groove fricative articulated near the back of the teeth ridge with the front of the tongue.) Only primary syllabic stress is indicated.

MOORE TOWN

Words which also appear in Harris (n.d.) are included in brackets, alongside the corresponding listings below; Colonel Harris' original spellings are retained (ex., arete [arretteh, CLGH]). (A few of the items appearing in this list have also been noted in Dalby 1971 and Cassidy & Le Page 1980.)

A

a	he, she, it
abásó	bowl
abásó tik	drum-stick
abukíng	stone
adawó/adowá	metallic percussion instrument
afána	machete, cutlass
akáni tik	drum-stick
akéte	cot, bed
akéte/akéke/akrékre [akikreh, CLGH]	abeng (i.e., signalling horn)
am	him, her, you (obj.)
ampáng/ampóngko	complete, much (as in 'sabi ampang')
anángka	snake
apísi	letter, message
aréte [arretteh, CLGH]	all right
árik/hárík/arík/hárík	hear, listen
as/has	spirit medium (i.e., 'horse')
asáfo hous/osáfu hous	ceremonial house (or area)

B

ba	brother
bére/béri/béli	belly
béri	very
bési	woman, child
béti	to bet
bígi	big, old
bígi ísho	the sea
bígiman	ancestor
bigipre	grave
bín	be, come, go
bláka/báká/bráka	black
blákabwai/bákabwai	bottle
bo	boy
búku	cramp, injure
bújufra/búsufra/obújufra	blood
bükun	book
búta	bow-and-arrow
buwé	dog

CH

chai	carry, take
------	-------------

D

dákuma/dakú/dakó	child
débe/débre	dead, death
débrekin/débekin/débeklin	dawn
dédekum	mirror
dígaman	hoe (i.e., 'digger-man')
díndi/diindi	clothes, hand, foot, eyes, belly
dúfe	knife

E

e/he	verbal marker (durative)
éde	head
ém̄ba	anybody

F

fáinggrien	rice (i.e., 'fine-grain')
féte [feteh, CLGH]	to fight, to dance for sickness
féteman/oféteman	Kromanti ritual specialist
fútu/ofútu	leg, foot
fútpuosuol	shoe, boot (i.e., 'foot post-hole')

G

grádfa/gráfara/grángfa	grandfather
gúdu [goodu, CLGH]	good
gúdufa	well, carefully
gyálá	girl, woman

H

hóndad han	banana bunch (i.e., 'hundred-hand')
------------	-------------------------------------

I

i	you
iis/yis/yiis [yees, CLGH]	yes
índi	name, hand, belly, ears
ingkechá	headscarf

ingkéswa	egg
ísa	rum
ísho/íshó	water

J

jájomp	far away
jákisa	rum
jége [djegay, CLGH]	divining instrument
jénkem kótoki	adult
jet	to get
ji	to give
jíjifo [jíjifo, CLGH]	evade, fool, trick
jóngga/júngga	lance, spear

K

kándal	clothes
késu/tésu	stand up, sit down
ki/kii [kee, CLGH]	to kill
küür	take care of, prepare
klem	climb
kō [cohn, CLGH]	to come
kō [cohn, CLGH]	cousin
kójo	walking stick
kónđri	country
kongkongrába	abeng (i.e., signalling horn)
kóngkōsa	gossip
kónjo	yam (specifically, St. Vincent yam)
kre	to clear
kréba	clever
kríkri	quickly, quick
kubáiti	goodbye
kúkram	kitchen, cook-house
kúmfu/kúfu	ritual specialist
kúta	dog
kwat	bamboo percussion instrument
kwítá	walk gracefully, dance

L

lási	arse, buttocks
láizi	cat
légonanan/légonan	distant place, far
lúku	to look at

M

máial	spirit possession (i.e., 'myal')
malâfo	salt, harmful substance
mánti	morning
méke	to make
midásem	salt
míldri/míljri	middle
mínibo	ground, earth, grave
mútú/mutú	mouth

N

na [na, CLGH]	be; at, in, on, etc. (loc. prep.)
náki	to hit, to knock
nási	spider (i.e., anansi)
ne (no + e)	won't (negative verbal modifier)
net	night
nínyã [nynneah/nynnyam, CLGH]	food, yams
nyába	to dance
nyámis	yams, cultivation ground
nyâs	yams
nyúman	man (i.e., 'young man')

O

o	he, she, it
obráye	loincloth
obrébo	indirect reference, veiled insult
obróni	outsider, non-Maroon
obúngge	eel
obwáso/obwásu	bowl
obwáto	boy
ófa/hófa/hóufa/úfa/húfa	how? (sometimes why?, or what?)
ógri/hóngri/ógli/hógli [ugly, CLGH]	evil, spirit-sickness
ógliman	obeah-man
óglitadi	hot pepper
okóko	fowl
okréma	chickenhawk
okréma	drummer
oníni	rain
ónku/hónku [uncku, CLGH]	uncle
ónti/hónti [hunty, CLGH]	what? (sometimes, which?, where?, who?)
opéte	vulture
opóngko	horse
opráko	pig
otúa	gun

P

pákit	personal spirit of ritual specialist
piik [peak, CLGH]	speak
píkibo	child
píkin	child
pinyáak/pinyáku	chickenhawk
prández	house, yard
pre/pres	place
prem/prim/trim [prem, CLGH]	prime, prepare
priis/priiz	pleased, pleasure
prínting/aprínting/oprínting	drum
pu/puu [poo, CLGH]	pull
puyáku/puyáak	banana

R

re	to ride
----	---------

S

sa	verbal marker (future)
sa	sister
sábi/sa [sabi, CLGH]	know, understand
sábiman	knowledgeable specialist
sabreké/sabréke	goat
sabrúsa	beads
salimióu	cat
sálwata	salt water
sálo	to use spirit power, without possession
salónggo	to cool down
sási/asási	ground, earth, grave
séke	sick
sháfana	dodge, fool, trick
shain	kerosene lamp
síkin	body, skin
sjref [shrehf, CLGH]	self
sónti [suhntic, CLGH]	thing
sótin	particular, certain
súma [summa, CLGH]	person, somebody
súmans/súmanz	crayfish
swára	swallow
swípswip	to sip
swírí/swéri [swee-swee man, CLGH]	swear

T

táki	talk
tákifa	money
tánopman	house
te [teh, CLGH]	tell
téka	to take
tem [tem, CLGH]	time
tére/teré [terreh, CLGH]	today
téretere	land, territory
tésu/késu	stand up, sit down
tímbambu/timbámbu	fire
tínya	sing, play (music)
titái	to tie, string, relative (kin)
titáiman	ritual specialist
tónbaig	to leave, turn back
tríifutman/chríifutman	pot (i.e., 'three-foot man')
tríiyaiman/chríiyaiman	coconut (i.e., 'three-eye man')
tuajína	to talk, discuss in private
tuakwántan	crossroads
túju/tújub	lance, spear
túro	tomorrow

U

úma/húma/húba/hub [umma, CLGH]	who? (sometimes, what?)
u	you

W

wáka [wakka, CLGH]	walk
wayukwám̄ba	chick
wérewu jéfru	moon
wíwi	wheeled vehicle
wúdu/údu/húdu/wúdi	woods, forest

Y

yánda	to sound (a drum)
yángga	to dance
yárifo	sick, dead; to kill, to hurt
ye [yeh, CLGH]	here
yéngkungku/yángkungku	Maroon
yerokúm	mirror

SCOTT's HALL

A

abúba	stone
adúfa/adúfe	fire
adúwa	gun
áfa	after
afána	machete, cutlass
áksi	to ask
akúta	dog
am	him, her, it, you (obj.)
atipó/hachibó	bed
awisa	pepper

B

béksis	angry (i.e., 'vexed')
bére/béri	belly
béri	very
bígi	big
bígipre	grave
bígisho/bígi ísho	the sea
bin	be, come, go
bládis/bláda/mbláda	blood
bláka/blákis/blákish	black
blákisman/blákishman	cooking-pot
bo	boy
bráda/bláda	brother
bro	to blow
bróbo	car
bróuni/abróuni	outsider, non-Maroon; outside place
bútwa	boot
bútwa	cousin

CH

chip	to sleep
------	----------

D

dágó	dog
déde	dead
dérokum	mirror
dosénggri	rope
doshénggri	sugar

E

engkéswa	egg
entáchwa	egg
engkwésta	fire-stick

F

fête	to fight, to dance for sickness
féteman/oféteman	ritual specialist and dancer
fráfra	fire
frákis	trousers
fre	friend
frémili	family
fútu	leg, foot

G

glaú/gláu	glass
grándi	drum
gráfara/grángfa	grandfather
gúdu	good

H

hágú	pig, hog
hánu	arm, hand
háta	what
hódio	Hello
hónti/ónhti	what (sometimes which, where)
hóufa	how

I

iis/yiis/hiis	yes
íúsjak	yes
imbúsú	cotton-tree
imbútwa	brother, cousin
indépe/indúse	knife
inkóko	fowl
jnsíkri	wine; sugar and water
jsa	rum
isho	water

J

jafána/jafán/jíjafana	evade, fool, trick
jége	divining instrument
jíaro	outsider, non-Maroon (derogatory)
jíjifo	evade, trick, fool
joséngwi	salt
joséngwij	cane-liquor
jram	to drink (i.e., 'dram')

K

kában/kabán	house, home
katú	bag carried over shoulder
kimbómbo	vagina
kítireri	corpse, dead
kójo	tree, walking stick
kónđri	country
krem	climb
krému	Maroon dance
kubáiti	goodbye
kükri	make haste
kúshu	cashew
kútakuta	chair
kwat	bamboo percussion instrument
kwita	walk, dance

L

lángteil	cow (i.e., 'long-tail')
lángteilsuofutu	cow (i.e., 'long-tail-four-feet')
lem	to chop
líbis	to live
lúku	to look at

M

máial	spirit possession (i.e., 'myal')
mánti	morning
mánu/mánsu/mánis	man
mbébwá	brother
mememép	goat
móngki	drum
múnúmunu	menstruation
mútú/móutu	mouth

N

na	be; at, in, on (loc. prep.)
nába	no
nábjak	no
náki	to hit, to knock
ne (no + e)	won't (negative verbal modifier)
nínibô	ground, earth, grave
nyúman	man (i.e., 'young man')

O

obróbo	indirect reference, insult
ógrí	evil, spirit-sickness
okrému	drummer
opéte	vulture
opréswa	woman

P

pákit	personal spirit of ritual specialist
píkibo	child
píkin	child
pinyáku	chickenhawk
prándes	yard, home, house
pre	place

R

rácha	medicinal herbs
-------	-----------------

S

sáfri hous	ceremonial house (or area)
sálínam	drum
sámbo	sun
sho	girl
shóman	crayfish
shóyo	Maroon dance
síkin	body, skin
sílbungga	snake
sjref	self
súma	person, somebody

T

táki	talk
tákifa	money
timbámbu	fire
tínya	to play, to dance
tónbaig	to leave, to turn back
tuajína	to talk privately
tuakwántan	crossroads

W

wáka/wákis	walk
wéte	white
wéteman	rice (i.e., 'white man')
wíngkaz	dancer's headtie
wúdu	woods, forest

Y

yárifo	corpse; injure
yéngko	us, ourselves

CHARLES TOWN

A

abróuni	a half-Maroon person; outsider
adáwa	metal percussion instrument
afána	machete
ákwa	drum
am	him, her, it, you (obj.)
anánti ará	the sun
apéte	vulture

B

babasínya wéngkini	a non-Maroon person
big ísho	the sea
bláka	black
bo inkóko	rooster
bráda	broad
búku	to do something bad (to somebody)

D

dadikóm	mirror
debeklín	dawn

F

féte	to fight, to dance for sickness
féteman	ritual specialist and dancer

G

grándi	drum
--------	------

H

hagúbu	pig, hog
hógli	evil
hógli bisáni	spirit-sickness

I

imbébwá	relative (kin)
inkóko	hen
ísa	rum
ísho	water

J

jíaro	stranger, non-Maroon (derogatory)
-------	-----------------------------------

K

kában/okában	house, home
késwa	egg
kõ	to come
krimpóng	pair of drums
kúmfu/küfu	ritual specialist

L

lángteil	cow (i.e., 'long tail')
lépman	toad

N

nángka	snake
nyángka	eel

O

obíowu	goat
ókreman	drummer

P

pákit	personal spirit of ritual specialist
píkibo	child
pinyáku	chickenhawk

S

sáfra grong/sáfri grong	dance-ground (ceremonial)
súmans/súmanz	crayfish

T

timbámbu	fire
tínya	to dance for pleasure
tuajína	to talk in private

W

wéngkini	stranger, non-Maroon
----------	----------------------

Y

yárifo	dead, sick
ye	here
yiiś	yes

REFERENCES

- AKERS, GLENN A., 1981. *Phonological variation in the Jamaican continuum*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Karoma Publishers, Inc.
- ALLEYNE, MERVYN C., 1980. *Comparative Afro-American: an historical-comparative study of English-based Afro-American dialects in the New World*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Karoma Publishers, Inc.
- BILBY, KENNETH M., 1981. The Kromanti Dance of the Windward Maroons of Jamaica. *Nieuwe West-Indische Gids* 55(1/2): 52-101.
- BRIDENBAUGH, CARL & BRIDENBAUGH, ROBERTA, 1972. *No peace beyond the line: the English in the Caribbean 1624-1690*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- CASSIDY, F. G. & LE PAGE, R. B., 1980. *Dictionary of Jamaican English*, second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CUNDALL, FRANK, 1919. The migration from Surinam to Jamaica. *Timehri* (3rd series) 6: 145-172.
- CURTIN, PHILIP D., 1969. *The Atlantic slave trade: a census*. Madison, Wisconsin and London: University of Wisconsin Press.
- DALBY, DAVID, 1971. Ashanti survivals in the language and traditions of the Windward Maroons of Jamaica. *African Language Studies* 12: 31-51.
- DALLAS, ROBERT CHARLES, 1803. *The history of the Maroons*, vol. I. London: A. Strahan.
- DECAMP, DAVID, 1977. The development of pidgin and creole studies. In Albert Valdman, ed., *Pidgin and creole linguistics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- DUNN, RICHARD S., 1972. *Sugar and slaves: the rise of the planter class in the English West Indies, 1624-1713*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- EDWARDS, BRYAN, 1796. *Observations on the disposition, character, manners, and habits of life of the Maroons*. London: John Stockdale.
- FURNESS, A. E., 1965. The Maroon War of 1795. *The Jamaican Historical Review* 5(2): 30-49.
- HALL-ALLEYNE, BEVERLEY, 1980. Language and dialect in Jamaica-issues. *African-Caribbean Institute of Jamaica Newsletter* 5: 7-18.
- HALL-ALLEYNE, BEVERLEY, 1982. Asante Kotoko: the Maroons of Jamaica. *African-Caribbean Institute of Jamaica Newsletter* 7: 3-40.
- HANCOCK, IAN F., 1969. A provisional comparison of the English-based Atlantic creoles. *African Language Review* 8: 7-72.

- HANCOCK, IAN F., 1972. A domestic origin for the English-derived Atlantic creoles. *The Florida FL Reporter* (Spring/Fall): 7-8; 52.
- HANCOCK, IAN F., 1981. Review of *A Krio-English Dictionary*, by Clifford N. Fyle & Eldred D. Jones. *English World-Wide* 2 (2): 247-260.
- HARRIS, C. L. G., n.d. *The Maroons of Moore Town (A Colonel Speaks)*. Unpublished manuscript.
- JOHNSON, SISTER MARY CANICE, 1974. Two morpheme structure rules in an English Proto-Creole. In David DeCamp & Ian F. Hancock, eds, *Pidgins and creoles: current trends and prospects*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- KOPYTOFF, BARBARA K., 1973. *The incomplete polities: an ethno-historical account of the Jamaica Maroons*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- LALLA, BARBARA, 1979. Sources for a history of Jamaican Creole. *Carib* 1: 50-66.
- LALLA, BARBARA, 1981. Quaco Sam: a relic of archaic Jamaican speech. *Jamaica Journal* 45: 20-29.
- LE PAGE, R. B., 1960. *Jamaican Creole*. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd.
- MOORE, JOSEPH G., 1953. *Religion of Jamaican Negroes: a study of Afro-Jamaican acculturation*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.
- MINTZ, SIDNEY W., 1971. The socio-historical background to pidginization and creolization. In Dell Hymes, ed., *Pidginization and creolization of languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- PRICE, RICHARD, 1976. *The Guiana Maroons: a historical and bibliographical introduction*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- PRICE, RICHARD & PRICE, SALLY, 1972. Saramaka Onomastics. *Ethnology II*: 341-367.
- SCHAFFER, DANIEL LEE, 1973. *The Maroons of Jamaica: African slave rebels in the Caribbean*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- SCHUCHARDT, HUGO, 1914. Die Sprache der Saramakkaneger in Surinam. *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen* 14 (6).
- SEBBA, MARK, 1982. Metathesis, epenthesis and liquids in Surinam Creole. *Amsterdam Creole Studies* 4: 23-37.
- SMITH, NORVAL, 1977. Vowel epithesis in the Surinam creoles. *Amsterdam Creole Studies* 1: 1-30.

- SMITH, NORVAL, 1978. On the liquifying of /d/ in the Surinam creole languages. *Amsterdam Creole Studies* 2: 115-123.
- THICKNESSE, PHILIP, 1788. *Memoirs and anecdotes of Philip Thicknesse, late lieutenant governor of Land Guard Fort, and unfortunately father to George Touchet, Baron Audley*. London: Printed for the author.
- VOORHOEVE, JAN, 1959. An orthography for Saramaccan. *Word* 15: 436-445.
- VOORHOEVE, JAN, 1971. Church creole and pagan cult languages. In Dell Hymes, ed. *Pidginization and creolization of languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- VOORHOEVE, JAN, 1973. Historical and linguistic evidence in favour of the relexification theory in the formation of creoles. *Language in Society* 2: 133-145.
- VOORHOEVE, JAN & URSY M. LICHTVELD, 1975. *Creole drum: an anthology of creole literature in Surinam*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- WHINNOM, KEITH, 1965. The origin of the European-based creoles and pidgins. *Orbis* 14: 509-527.
- WILLIAMS, JOSEPH J., 1938. The Maroons of Jamaica. *Anthropological Series of the Boston College Graduate School* 3: 379-471.

KENNETH M. BILBY
Department of Anthropology
The Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore MD 21218, U.S.A.

BOOK REVIEWS

Forged from the love of liberty: selected speeches of Dr. Eric Williams.
 Compiled and introduced by PAUL K. SUTTON. Trinidad:
 Longman Caribbean, 1981. 473 pp. (Paper £ 8.50)

"Trinidad in 1911", Eric Williams (1969: 25) wrote in his autobiography, "would move in only one direction — forward." But why 1911 when the island was a tightly controlled crown colony with little signs of any liberalization by the Colonial Office? The autobiography contains no clues, but a contextual reading will show that, in addition to being the year of his birth, 1911 marked, in his opinion, a national as well as a personal beginning. The baby of 1911 would move on to be an Island Scholar, an Oxford Ph.D., an University professor and finally, the Political Leader of Trinidad and Tobago for 24 years. He never appeared to have lost his egocentric view of his status and role, for his was, as he put it, an "inward hunger." He was "determined," he told us (1969: 343), "to prove that, like Dante's Ulysses, I

Could conquer the inward hunger that I had
 To master earth's experience, and to attain
 Knowledge of man's mind, both good and bad.

Eric Williams' autobiography (1969) calls forth W. Somerset Maugham's warning about all autobiographies: "No one can tell the whole truth about himself." And yet, the risks were perhaps less in the late 1960s than they are in the early 1980s.

Inward Hunger was written after fifteen years in office but before Williams faced the most serious challenge to his power and threat

to his reputation: the 1970 Black Power uprising and the mutiny of the Defence Force. This major historical watershed — which has yet to find its historian — shook the Political Leader and the complacent society to its foundations... for a brief spell. The elections of 1971 saw Williams' PNM gather 100% of Parliament's seats, yet the fact that this was achieved with 28% of the electorate voting left Williams unperturbed: He was now again in a position to tell anyone "come and he cometh, go and he goeth!"

Clearly, to write a biography of one so complex is a formidable task. It is just as well therefore that Dr. Paul K. Sutton calls himself a compiler rather than editor of this collection, for he appears to have had little to do with the whole work. Aside from the brief and, for all practical purposes, perfunctory introduction, the volume appears to have been the work of Eric Williams, who at the time of its writing (1980) was very much alive. Williams holds the copyright, and he wrote the Dedication and the Epilogue. Since the Introduction does not state that the Compiler made the selections or decided on their order of presentation, one can only conclude that these tasks were also performed by Williams. The Epilogue is definitely — because unmistakably — his. This is, then, an autobiographical look at his years in power (1955–1980), a companion volume to his *Inward hunger*.

Herbert Butterfield (1959: 36) warned us that "Our politicians now know that the historians are on their track, so that they prepare for them in advance — they write with the public in mind or they leave crucial things unrecorded." But it is precisely this autobiographical nature of the volume which gives it value. The book represents a sort of political last will and testament of a leader who took his own life only months after the work went to press. As such, it is the best collection of materials available with which to judge the protagonist, his goals and his success in fulfilling them. The work is organized into five parts: economic development (22 separate speeches or articles), political development (20 items), the national community (16 items), Independence (20 items) and international relations (11 items). These are followed by a 41-page Epilogue which appears to be the last thing he wrote and thus far published.

In this volume there is the Williams of 1955 eulogizing Puerto

Rico and Arthur Lewis, whom he would emulate in his effort to make Trinidad "the industrial centre of the entire Caribbean" (p. 8). There is Williams promising to end the immorality and dishonesty of Trinidad life by creating a disciplined political party modeled on the PNP of Jamaica (p. 109). There is Williams accepting the Westminster Parliamentary constitution and system, reasoning that "After all, if the British Constitution is good enough for Great Britain, it should be good enough for Trinidad and Tobago" (p. 129). Or, again in 1955, there is Williams of Woodford Square using history and sociology to build a political following. "This problem of race is essentially modern" he would tell his largely black working class audiences, introducing them to Sepulveda, Las Casas, Long, Edwards, Froude, Carlyle, Trollope, Fernando Ortiz, José Martí, Frank Tannenbaum. And so his speeches were lectures on the meaning of Federation (when the PNM suffered its one and only electoral loss), Independence and its various 5-year plans. This volume also has the Williams of 1970, first sympathizing with the demands of Black Power; "If this is Black Power then I am for Black Power." (Was this not an extension of his 1961 "Massa Day Done", speech?) But it contains no documentation of his appeals, on the verge of being overthrown, for British, U.S. and Venezuelan assistance.

There is the post-Black Power call and promise of a shift in course, accelerating the nationalization of the society (rather than its socialization) — at all levels, but most importantly by government participation in new industry and the sale of government-held shares in existing industry.

In other words, in these pages there is the early Williams and the later Williams, and as with any leader whose career spans such a length of time, it is difficult to conclude which is the "real" man. This is where the Epilogue will tip the scales towards a particular historical interpretation of Williams. With a stream-of-consciousness style, Williams has legated a document steeped in cynicism and invective; an outpouring of resentment and frustration, pettiness and pique so palpable in its anguished and tortured nature as to appear nearly paranoid.

This last evaluation is not made lightly, for the evidence of

Williams' persistent sense of persecution and fear of victimization is now beginning to appear.¹ The first to write of it publicly was Dr. Winston Mahabir (1978), a Minister in the first pre-Independence Cabinet, who relates the Prime Minister's constant fears of plotting by his Ministers, Muslims and even, at one point, a "Chinese coalition." Next came Dr. Patrick Solomon (1981); like Mahabir an M.D., Solomon was close to Williams from the very beginning, holding down several cabinet and diplomatic posts until 1977 when he "could no longer continue to serve a Prime Minister whose petty spite and personal animosities were placed before the national interests."

But this Epilogue is worth analyzing in depth for reasons other than the search for the psychopathological in Williams' personality. It is the clearest indication thus far of the depth and scope of the decline of the early and original ideas and ideals with which Williams — through the PNM — launched Trinidad into party politics, Independence and nationhood.

The scholar whose celebrated historical materialist interpretations of capitalism and slavery never once quoted Marx, Engels or other early historical materialists now quotes Lenin to describe Latin America as financially and diplomatically dependent. The Caribbean, that area which he laid so many claims to understanding and explaining sympathetically, is nothing more than "an appendage of metropolitan economics, pandering to metropolitan vices and contemporary deviants" (p. 420). The Puerto Rico he once so admired is now "a farce," Cuba and Jamaica are "mere dependencies," and even the Caribbean sea is becoming "as polluted as the Mediterranean."

The Caribbean Group for Cooperation and Economic Development ("originally a Trinidad and Tobago proposal" [p. 446]) is now "a high-falutin title . . . much ado about nothing" (p. 448). CARICOM? ". . . that too is on its last legs" (p. 441). The North-South dialogue for which he originally travelled around the world? ". . . a total waste of time" (p. 449). The man who spent his political career calling for "discipline and production" now lambasts the island's private sector for doing the same and borrows from Vidiadhar Naipaul to jeer: "What will our capitalist mimic-men do now?" More, he warns that they are "still as hostile as ever

to the PNM (*sic*) whom they are determined to remove by hook or by crook — more likely by crook" (p. 427). There is the list of "enemies among us" and those outside. But one need not delve. The point has been made that this was a Political Leader in personal isolation and turmoil who only months later would die under circumstances pointing to suicide. The call for relief which ends this apostrophe he labelled an Epilogue is telling: "The Political Leader awaits the Party's democratic arrangements and decisions for the election of a new leader to lead Party and Nation forward . . ." (p. 458).

The island's history will record that this had not been the first such call. In 1969 Williams complained of the "pressures from individual citizens and sectional interests," finding relief only in his private study upstairs, "turning off the lights downstairs, taking the telephone off the hook. Achieving peace at the price of air and sunlight . . ." The Deputy Prime Minister, A.N.R. Robinson, took this to heart, truly sought to relieve Williams, and got his political head guillotined.

And in 1973 Williams again shocked the Party Annual Convention by saying that he was tired of being "a bridge over troubled waters", surrounded by incompetents — "mill-stones," as he called them. "I have no desire, whatsoever," he said then, "to hold on to what is called power" (p. 180). His Attorney General, Karl Hudson-Phillips, took the call for new leadership to heart . . . and got his political head guillotined. Is it any surprise that one of the most pervasive, collectively-held fears among PNM higher-ups was the "fear of the old man"? (See Ryan 1982.)

But the man who seemed cold and invincible clearly was not; he had in fact understood and conveyed with charisma and lucidity what he was about. Williams, the original thinker, the historical researcher and sociologist, had early understood the dangers of political leadership in Trinidad. In his often-quoted "Responsibilities of the Party Member" (September 30, 1960), he spoke of the "disgraceful individualism" which characterized the Island's politics and the irritation caused by the "anarchical relations which have been allowed to grow up between the Political Leader and the Party" (p. 119). A major responsibility of the Party member, therefore, had to be "relieving the strain on the Political Leader."

The problem was that while he understood these dangers intellectually, he continually subordinated them to higher political, i.e. personal, power considerations. This fact emerges clearly and unequivocally from this collection.

First and foremost there was Williams' firm belief that only a "disciplined" party could move Trinidad forward. Politics, he repeatedly told private groups, was a science and he, the Political Leader, had mastered that science. As such, he, the Political Leader, had "a very clear and special responsibility." He did not equivocate in 1958 when he told the convened Party that "the grasp of the whole" at any particular time was the work of the Political Leader:

...he is the main source of its ideals and of its political and social attitudes.
...is the source of inspiration, ideas and facts and research for journalists, orators....from the highest to the lowest [they] take the inspiration and the structure and tone of their work from the theoretical leader [pp. 114-115].

If this was the theory, it differed not one iota from the practice. Trinidadians soon learned to read the special language of the Political Leader. The surest sign that a project was to be delayed was when it had to "go to Cabinet"; and they knew it was definitely dead when it was passed on to "the appropriate Ministry."

Who would dare challenge such a comprehensive vision and practice of power? Those who did in the early days (e.g., *The Trinidad Guardian*) suffered the consequences, not through any tyrannical measures but through the popular pressures of the charismatic, nationalist and populist social movement that was the PNM in the 1950's and 60's. In such a context Williams never had to use force. Had Williams limited himself to being the apex of power, delegating decisions to the excellent array of technocrats and civil servants which he inherited, things would have gone differently. He was, however, *all* the power. Who could argue that the island had a built-in agricultural sector when to the very end he spoke of Indian Trinidadians as if they were still an immigrant group (see p. 451)? Who was there to convince him that the occasional criticisms from the Island's popular R.C. Archbishop were not "merely... opportunity for the conventional criticism

and vilification of the Prime Minister" (p. 457) but rather the pondered thoughts of a loyal Trinidadian who did not happen to be dependent on him (or "indentured" as Mahabir put it)? Who, finally and most critically, could challenge his obsession with high technology and capital-intensive industrialization which produced the Point Lisas industrial park? (By 1981 this project had absorbed fully 25% of the special Development Funds created from the petro-dollar boom of the mid-1970's.) Local critics were accused of suffering from a "brown sugar mentality," while his international critics merely wanted to perpetuate the "colonial prohibition of industry" in the colonies. And no one could put a charge like that in historical context better than Williams.

Other than the Epilogue, the most recent statements include the January 1980 address at the signing of the FERTRIN Project and the February 1980 address at the awarding of scholarships at the Point Lisas industrial park. By then, Williams had long since given up public (and even private) political campaigning of any sort and was single-mindedly bent on the energy-based industrialization of the island. Sustained by the mid-1970's flood of petro-dollars, Williams launched projects in iron and steel (ISCOTT), fertilizers (FERTRIN) and ammonia (TRINGEN), and was going ahead with plans for heavy investments in methanol, urea, an aluminum smelter and ("...overshadowing these projects both in costs and complexity") the Liquified Natural Gas Project. His speech was now filled with technical language and descriptions of various contracts and arrangements. Trinidad and Tobago, he would repeatedly say, "was attempting to take a step into the international industrial community" (p. 89). What was aimed for was nothing less than, as Sutton uncritically puts it, "...one of the biggest energy-based manufacturing complexes in Latin America and the Caribbean" (p. xxxiv).

By 1982, the IMF verified the fears of the much maligned local critics: none of the established industries — not cement, not fertilizers, not ammonia, not iron — were self-supporting; all of those under construction were showing serious cost overruns and their targeted markets were severely depressed.

There is growing evidence that, starting in 1970 and as a direct consequence of the Black Power challenge to his supremacy,

Williams abandoned central planning and with that his cadre of experts. An ever-increasing number of "priority projects" were selected on a target-of-opportunity basis — all made possible by the petro-dollar windfall. Point Lisas was his priority but there were also scandalous expenditures such as the \$250 million race track which led Patrick Solomon to conclude (1981: 252) that, while Grenada's Eric Gairy's squandermania was more or less personal, "The Eric Williams variety is on a national scale."

Sutton tells us that Williams' favourite aphorism was: "those who make their bed must lie on it." The bed Williams made and in which Trinidadians and Tobagonians must now lie is a mixed one: they have enjoyed great freedom and relative prosperity before and during the Williams era, but the 24 years of unchallenged power have left an economic and attitudinal legacy which is only now showing clear outlines. This volume is an invaluable aid to understanding why and how this came about. It is for the post-Williams generation to do something about it.

NOTE

1. There is a tone in Trinidad speech which might easily be seen as evidence of paranoia. C. L. R. James, for example, remarked as he left the PNM in 1960: "... who opposes what I here advocate is an enemy of the Party and of the People of the country. Mark them well and distrust them now and for always" (1962:8). In Williams' case, however, the fear was personal, rather than about the Party.

REFERENCES

- BUTTERFIELD, HERBERT, 1959. *George III and the historians*. New York, MacMillan.
- JAMES, C. L. R., 1962. *Party politics in the West Indies*. Trinidad, Vedic Enterprises.
- MAHABIR, WINSTON, 1978. *In and out of politics*. Port-of-Spain, Inprint Caribbean.
- RYAN, SELWYN, 1982. Doctorphobia and decision-making. *Sunday Express*, March 28: 23, 25.
- SOLomon, PATRICK, 1981. *Solomon: an autobiography*. Port-of-Spain: Inprint Caribbean.

WILLIAMS, ERIC, 1969. *Inward hunger: the education of a Prime Minister*. London, Andre Deutsch.

ANTHONY P. MAINGOT

Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology
Florida International University
Miami FL 33199, U.S.A.

Resistance and Caribbean literature. SELWYN R. CUDJOE. Athens OH, Chicago and London: Ohio University Press. 1980. xii + 319 pp.
(Cloth US\$ 20.00, Paper US\$ 8.95)

Dark ancestor: the literature of the Black man in the Caribbean. O. R. DATHORNE. Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1981. x + 288 pp. (Cloth US\$ 20.00)

Caribbean literature is the product of so many races, languages, cultures, nationalities, and places that it defies definition. Scholars have reacted to this diversity by focusing on the literature of one race, one language, one culture, one nationality, one place, or a combination of these, usually limiting their studies still further to one era, one genre, or one author. The result is that there are almost no works that treat Caribbean literature as a whole. A comprehensive literary history of the Caribbean probably being, at least for the present, out of the question for even a group of scholars, the only apparent way one can approach this body of literature as a whole is to impose upon it some unifying thesis or theme suggested by recurrences within the literature, as G. R. Coulthard did in *Race and Colour in Caribbean Literature*. The slimness of Coulthard's volume belies its title, as if the author viewed the impossibility of treating even a great portion of Caribbean literature as self-evident. But comprehensiveness can be the least troublesome aspect of this approach to literature.

Two recently published books that offer unifying theses on Caribbean literature are *Resistance and Caribbean literature* by Selwyn R. Cudjoe and *Dark ancestor: the literature of the Black Man in the Caribbean* by O. R. Dathorne. The thesis of Cudjoe's book is that political resistance is both the inspiration and the purpose of

Caribbean literature. Cudjoe argues that “‘every serious work of literature is a live human document reflecting the epoch’s actual historical processes and phenomena,’” that the three periods of Caribbean history (1500 to 1800, 1800 to 1960, and 1960 to the present) are “all characterized by violence perpetrated against Caribbean peoples and their political resistance,” and that therefore the serious work of Caribbean literature reflects this resistance. But not only does history determine literature; literature determines history. “When resistance is the chief preoccupation of a country, the aesthetic must become political. Since these men are fighting a struggle to the death, poetry and literature become the conscious unity of will, thought, and desire coalesced with revolutionary activity.” Thus “literature becomes functional in that it has a very real task to perform” — furthering the political resistance. Writing, then, is “a political act,” and literature and politics are “fused,” “indissoluble.” It is the function of the critic to “show an understanding of the ‘historical processes and phenomena’ out of which a literature grows” and to “examine artistic form as a vehicle for carrying forward ideological content.”

Nearly a fourth of Cudjoe’s book is devoted to the history of resistance in the Caribbean and to the theory that relates political resistance and literature. The rest of the book is an examination of the literature itself. Cudjoe organizes his chapters according to his view of the historical process of resistance, beginning with unsuccessful resistance and going on through movements for liberation and the establishment of self-government and independence to revolutionary violence and finally the creation of a new society. Within this framework, he traces the development of various cultural movements, paying special attention to Négritude, and tries to show how the literature shifted from classicism” and “pre-romantic” representation, which depicted resistance in an “idealized” way, to “revolutionary romanticism,” which paved the way for “realism,” whether “socio-psychological” or “socio-political.” What Cudjoe calls “critical realism” has, he says, more nearly than any other representation been “able to elucidate the causal relationship between the opposing tendencies in Caribbean society, which are the particular essence of the Caribbean experience.” Because a writer must “shape,” as well as “reveal” and

"record" his political environment, the critic will judge him not only according to how well — how realistically, but critically — he portrays the resistance within his society, but also according to how much he furthers the cause of democracy — the aim of resistance.

Cudjoe, practicing what he preaches, treats only those works that deal with resistance, beginning with accounts of Indian resistance to Spanish colonizers. He judges each work according to the success with which it critically records what he sees as the realistic view of resistance and advocates what he sees as the most fruitful mode of resistance in the future. Thus Cudjoe deems works failures if they fall short of these demands — and most of them do, at least in part. Even Carpentier's *Explosion in a cathedral* — which Cudjoe admits is "one of the 'chief achievements of the new Hispanic-American era,'" a novel whose "sweep is enormous, its vision panoramic, and its literary achievement astounding" — fails, because Carpentier expounds a cyclical rather than a spiral theory of history.

The problem with Cudjoe's approach is that it is less analytically descriptive than it is ideologically prescriptive. Cudjoe is more concerned with what the artist "should," "must" do than with what he does do. In Cudjoe's view, the more nearly the artist becomes one of the "tools of resistance," a spokesman for "the democratic struggle of the masses for liberation," analyzing "the cause of our oppression" and showing "the way towards liberation," the more successful his literature will be. But in the end so few works fully meet Cudjoe's criteria that one is forced to conclude that the connection between resistance and literature may not be so strong as Cudjoe suggests.

Among the various critics and authors with whom Cudjoe finds fault is R. M. Lacovia, because he "holds to the imperative that the only true preoccupations of the Caribbean writer are African concepts." It is these African concepts that O. R. Dathorne examines in his book, *Dark ancestor*. Whereas Cudjoe focuses upon resistance in Caribbean literature, Dathorne concentrates on synthesis. Viewing the New World as "an extension of Africa," "a Black invention" in which "the colonized . . . altered the cultural vision of the colonizer," Dathorne argues that there have been

"two syntheses, the second of which is still taking place." The "primary synthesis" was the "reorganization of the Old World groups from Africa and Europe," though Dathorne is concerned only with the synthesis of the "Hausa, Ibo, Yoruba, or Ashanti" who, "by the very nature of [their] passage," were transformed, synthesized, into "nigger, negro, Negro, Colored, Quashie, African, Black." The "secondary synthesis," which may never be completed, is between the "White European" and the "Black African Negro" — "one in which attributes from all groups will become intrinsic parts of a large supergroup." An example of secondary synthesis, Dathorne says, can be seen in the poetry of Henny F. Zeil of Suriname, which is written in Sranan tongo.

That Dathorne speaks of groups from Africa being synthesized into a new group called "African" is indicative of other problems. The title itself is imprecise: the book is about literature (as well as other things) written *on* Blacks (as well as Mulattos) *by* Whites, Mulattos, and Blacks. Moreover, Dathorne's use of *Caribbean* is misleading. What one expects to find in *Dark ancestor* is a follow-up to the final chapter of Dathorne's *The Black mind: a history of African literature* — a chapter entitled "'Africa' in Caribbean literature," in which "Caribbean literature" seems to mean the literature of the islands of the Caribbean and Guyana. Instead, *Dark ancestor* is about the literature of "the Black man's New World," this world encompassing "the southern rim of the United States, eastern Mexico, and the Caribbean regions of Central America, Brazil, Venezuela, and the Guyanas," as well as "Canada, the United States, and Central and South America when relevant." What one finds is a collection of loosely related chapters which are themselves loosely constructed, ranging, after the introductory chapters explaining and illustrating the extension of Africa into the New World, from "Africa affirmed in Afro-American literature" (in which Dathorne traces the rise of the awareness of an African heritage in the United States up to the Harlem Renaissance, ending with a discussion of Jean Toomer's *Cane*, which, he suggests, fails to make the African connection) to "Responses to Africa" (in which, he discusses mainly white writers, extolling Carpentier's *Écue-Yamba-Ó!* as a novel "in which the clear embodiment of the African past is so clearly depicted," but, in

general, condemning White writers, who "confirm the inferiority of the Black man and . . . establish the stereotype that Black writers would use later on") to "Contact, conflict and reconciliation" (in which he discusses the Mulatto in literature, concluding with a long account of the life of the Cuban Mulatto poet Plácido) to "Afro-New World movements: Harlem Renaissance, Negrista, and Negritude" (in which he focuses upon Negrista, saying almost nothing about the Harlem Renaissance) to "The Black Pluriverse" (in which he discusses Brazilian literature and the poetry of Derek Walcott and Edward Brathwaite). The difficulties inherent in Dathorne's book because he does not restrict his coverage to either literature or the Caribbean are compounded by his tendency to stray from his topic. He usually finds his way back, but too often the parts seem unrelated either to one another or to the whole. (While Cudjoe's book was not proofread as carefully as it should have been, Dathorne's book suffers from both an apparent lack of proofreading and, in places, an apparent lack of writing. See, for example, page 218, which contains a whole paragraph that appears to be a series of notes.)

Cudjoe, towards the end of his book, uses the phrase "the need for a new collective identity"; and Dathorne, coincidentally on the identical page in his book, uses the phrase "a restoration of their group identity." Although both authors up to this point seem intent on avoiding the use of the word *identity*, both are, to a great extent, re-working the commonly acknowledged pervasive theme of identity — here, group identity — in Caribbean literature. But Caribbean literature being as broad as it is and comprehensiveness not being an aim of either author, the works they treat do not usually overlap. Given the absence of a literary history of the Caribbean comparable to, say, Baugh's *Literary History of England* or Spiller's *Literary History of the United States*, one might profitably turn to these two volumes as a guide — often, especially in Cudjoe's book, a detailed guide — to the literature of the Caribbean. But one will scarcely find "'every serious work'" here — partly because some serious works (for example, Derek Walcott's splendid love poem "Islands") seem to be immune to theses of any kind.

REFERENCES

BAUGH, ALBERT C. (ed.), 1948). *A literary history of England*. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts.

COULTHARD, G. R., 1962. *Race and colour in Caribbean literature*. London, Oxford University Press, for the Institute of Race Relations.

SPILLER, ROBERT E. et al. (eds.), 1959. *Literary history of the United States*. New York, Macmillan.

SUE N. GREENE

Division of English and American Literature
Towson State University
Towson MD 21204, U.S.A.

To windward of the land: the occult world of Alexander Charles. JANE C. BECK. Foreword by ROGER D. ABRAHAMS. Bloomington IN and London: Indiana University Press, 1979. (Distributed in Latin America and the Caribbean by Feffer and Simons.) 1 + 309 pp. (Cloth US\$ 17.50, £ 9.00)

At the ripe age of seventy, Alexander Charles met folklorist Jane Beck and her husband in St. Lucia. In the course of intermittent visits in the early 1970s, Charles became Mrs. Beck's protector and teacher, initiating her into his system of supernatural belief and folk medicinal practice. *To Windward of the Land* stands as delightful fruit of their relationship. In it Beck recounts Charles' life story and reproduces many of their conversations, at once projecting the beliefs and ideas against which Charles' life can be viewed, and telling of her own initiation.

Life history has been used to good effect in other studies of Caribbean societies — most notably by Sidney Mintz, M. G. Smith, and Peter Wilson. (Curiously, in these societies where women play such prominent roles, none of the more lengthy accounts has yet taken a woman as its subject.) Unlike these anthropologists, however, all of whom have written life histories after having done extensive ethnographic fieldwork, Jane Beck's account is not grounded in firsthand ethnographic research on the

society in which Charles lives. While this does not detract from the importance of Charles' autobiography, it does impair the acuity of the author's analytical statements, and leads one to be apprehensive about the portrayal of her subject's social field.

Alexander Charles is unconcernedly trans-national: in his wanderings throughout the Caribbean he claims to have fathered children in the Hispanophone Dominican Republic, in Anglophone Antigua, as well as in Dominica, and St. Lucia — both bilingual in French Creole and English. Like Don Taso of Mintz's *Worker in the Cane*, Charles has been accustomed to working for a living since well before the age of ten; he just about raised himself into manhood. He has made a living as smuggler, fisherman, sugar cane worker, and watchman. He has been a strike-breaker and folk medicinal advisor; for the former he was rewarded with a job as foreman at one of the firms handling bunker coal at Castries. If all this makes for engaging reading in the North Atlantic, it is all the more remarkable for being a life story not outstanding in an Antillian social setting.

To say this is but to endorse this autobiography's importance as a social document. The narrative gives Charles' reflections — sometimes as detached observer, other times as interested participant — on important events in St. Lucia's modern social history. Moreover, his story emphasizes the interconnectedness of Caribbean societies (a characteristic that social scientists have come to pay attention to only recently); Charles' own experiences hint at how movement from one island to the other not only affords new economic opportunities, but might serve as a social mechanism for reducing inter-personal tensions, and for allowing the individual to redeem himself and to pass from one social status to another in his own society. Beck, largely neglectful of the social, pursues issues such as these only insofar as they confirm a West Indian sense of personhood: she stresses the degree to which Charles, in daily life and as narrator, exemplifies West Indian values of courage and power.

Beck suggests, further, that Charles is representatively West Indian in the main outlines of his belief system. Sorcery (obeah), she posits, is one important plank for the attainment of recognition and power — one that Charles himself employs. Moreover, prac-

titioners maintain their notoriety because of their ability to address important psycho-social illnesses caused by stress in inter-personal relations. Thus, Beck claims to account for the frequent recourse to supernatural remedies evident throughout the narrative. Her assertion, following George Foster, that peasant communities are particularly likely to exhibit strained and tense inter-personal relations, raises more questions than it resolves. What factors make for inter-personal tension? Why does strain seem to arise in some relationships and not in others?

Beck reduces the complexity of how Caribbean social relations are ordered to the idea that there is a "gulf between feeling and acting" (p. 270) — that Antillians value ideals of gregarious behavior even as, in practice, they harbor deep-seated suspicion in their dealings with others. She suggests (as have others before her, bewildered by the region's complexity), that these are societies of ambivalent people. Yet in arriving at her conclusion she fails to attend closely either to the structure of Alexander Charles' personal relations, or to their wider social context in other than the most general terms. "As peasant-fisherman he shared the bottom rung of the social-economic scale with the bulk of St. Lucia's population" (p. xx). The reader yearns at times for clarification and further probing; one itches to know more, for instance, about the nature of the relationship between Charles and his first spouse (whom he leaves abruptly to go to the Dominican Republic but apparently rejoins after a five-year absence), about Charles' land dispute with his maternal relatives, and about his ties with Mr. Barnard, the businessman who persuades him to break the coal handler's strike. Besides this we need to have some discussion of the great investment that Antillians make in people, the extreme degree in which they rely on personal relations to accomplish their goals, and the well-articulated normative strictures that govern these ties.

Another worrisome aspect of the book is that it immortalizes in print discussions that might prove embarrassing to those mentioned in them. Actions that would be discussed surreptitiously in the Caribbean, that might even be illegal, and that could well tarnish people's reputations, come out in Charles' narrative and are reproduced by Beck with little apparent attempt either to

substantiate their veracity or to disguise the identities of people to whom Charles refers. Again, this suggests an insensitivity on the author's part that a fuller ethnographic immersion into St. Lucian life might have remedied.

Beck probes with more enthusiasm the formal elements of Charles' medicinal repertoire and his notions of the supernatural. Many of their free-flowing conversations give important insights into ideas of causation and into the medicinal cures employed by Caribbean folk. From these intriguing discussions, however, she is more concerned to construct a pan-West Indian supernatural universe, in which the "Devil," "bolum," and the silk cotton tree each has its place, than to show how these various elements are combined or neglected from one situation and place to the next.

The shortcomings in this book's brief analytical forays are more than offset by the compelling life story of Alexander Charles that Beck has so painstakingly produced. The degree of intimacy she achieves as his surrogate daughter led Charles to be expansive, sincere, and unstinting in their long conversations together, "Ay yay yay, Janie. You want to kill me. I going so deep with you..." (p. 157). She, in turn, has passed on to students of Caribbean society rich source materials for further reflection.

(A French version of this review is due to appear in *L'Homme*.)

CHARLES V. CARNEGIE
Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology
Bates College
Lewiston ME 04240, U.S.A.

Labor migration under capitalism: the Puerto Rican experience. HISTORY TASK FORCE, CENTRO DE ESTUDIOS PUERTORRIQUEÑOS. New York and London: Monthly Review Press, 1979. 287 pp. (Paper US\$ 6.50, £ 3.55)

The emigration dialectic: Puerto Rico and the U.S.A. MANUEL MALDONADO-DENIS. (Translated from the Spanish by ROBERTO SIMON CRESPI.) New York: International Publishers, 1980. 156 pp. (Cloth US\$ 9.50, Paper US\$ 3.25)

Much of the literature on labor migration has been ahistorical and theoretically impoverished. These strains are particularly apparent in many academic and official studies of Puerto Rican migration. A cursory review of this literature reveals an excessive concern with empiricism and palpable avoidance of discussing the structural factors which propel segments of the Puerto Rican nation to wander in search of their livelihood. These ideologically imposed limitations on theory and methodology at best confound a complex social-economic reality, and at worst are the intellectual roots of disasterous social policies.

The critique of mainstream migration studies is the common backdrop of the two books under review. These works advance important commentary against the prevailing normative and ideological underpinnings inherent in many migration studies. Although the works differ markedly in their respective levels of theoretical development and analytical sophistication, both powerfully articulate the need to explore the dynamic relations between capitalist social relations of production and the perpetual circulation and recirculation of Puerto Rican labor.

Two themes are subject to scrutiny: (1) Malthusian constructs which posit an inverse relationship between economic growth and population growth and (2) studies which optimistically envision the future and full incorporation of the Puerto Rican population into the prevailing social and economic order of the United States. Both books directly confront these two major analytical pre-occupations of mainstream migration literature. However, the subjugation of Puerto Rican workers, and their constant rotation in reaction to the requirements of capitalist production are not

seen as unique. Rather, it is argued that international migration is a structural, historically grounded reality endemic to the global expansion of the capitalist mode of production. The Puerto Rican reality is the focus of the study, but this reality is situated in a global context. However, Puerto Rico's colonial status is distinctive and generates special conditions that operate in conjunction with the material forces of production.

Through these books we see that unquestioned presuppositions and intentional distortions of the intricacies of social reality in capitalist society have guided much of the existing research on Puerto Rican migration. A presumption which has attained the status of doctrine in certain quarters is that of a natural harmony between population size and the capacity of the productive system to accommodate those capable of working. However, it is argued that in Puerto Rico and other colonial and neo-colonial social formations the relentless expansion of population naturally outstrips the capacity of any economic system to provide for the material well-being of its society. Maldonado-Denis and the History Task Force of the Puerto Rican Studies Center unequivocally confront this prevailing orthodoxy and argue that the phenomenon of relative surplus population (overpopulation) is a derivative of the tendential laws of motion of capitalist relations of production. For historical materialists, relentless technological innovation is an inherent property of capitalist production, and this tendency to continuously increase the productivity of labor while simultaneously diminishing the amount of labor time required for commodity production will result in the eventual displacement of large sectors of the working class.

Both books also bring to task migration apologists who tend to accept uncritically the notion that with time Puerto Ricans will inevitably be incorporated as equals into the prevailing social order. Enlightened humanitarian policies, the homogenizing experience of the workplace, and constant exposure to dominant social values, modes of behavior and cultural symbols are potent forces which should result in the full assimilation of the mainland Puerto Ricans. Yet the intractable poverty among broad sectors of the Puerto Rican population, the preservation of national identity and cultural symbols in an alien world, and the pervasive exclu-

sion from the major institutions of economic, social and political life are compelling realities which challenge these optimistic projections.

Although both books address the same problematic, and adhere to a common intellectual tradition, there are substantial differences in style and methodology which warrant commentary.

Labor Migration Under Capitalism, which is the more historically grounded and theoretically advanced book, consists of two separate but interrelated sections. The first section includes a sophisticated theoretical framework which draws upon central tenets of orthodox historical materialism, and three carefully researched essays which fruitfully employ conceptualizations advanced in the framework. The first section provides a meticulously constructed and historically based refutation of the neo-Malthusian constructs noted above. The concluding section contains a set of important essays which analyze significant social issues associated with the migration experience. These include a critique of assimilationist theories by Clara Rodríguez, a preliminary analytical approach to the study of demographics by José Vásquez Calzada, and an analysis of the legal and political aspects of the migrant farm worker system by Felipe Rivera.

The principal structural and class properties of colonial Puerto Rico prior to 1898 are analyzed and serve as a point of departure for assessing twentieth-century developments. Through careful historical analysis the book documents the sustained and widespread effects of the progressive development of the commercial sugar monopoly which eventually dominated the Puerto Rican economy for over three decades. Internal migrations, displacement of the peasantry and its reintegration as a wage laboring class, the destruction of a nascent agrocommercial capitalist sector, the intensified disarticulation of the insular economy and the implantation of a colonial apparatus responsive to imperialist initiatives were among the legacies of the early period of U.S. colonial rule. The authors maintain that an accelerated transition to a capitalist mode of production set into motion structural transformations which established the foundations for subsequent wholesale circulation of Puerto Rican labor. The section concludes with an important statement tracing the evolution of alter-

native models of capital accumulation. Changes in the domestic economy are seen as structurally linked to transformations in the metropolis. Particular emphasis is given to the relationship between labor intensive industrialization seeking to capitalize on the island's huge labor reserves, and the unprecedented displacement of Puerto Ricans to other labor markets outside of the island. The complicity of the colonial administration in promoting massive migration is discussed in the context of the necessity to diminish expenditures required to sustain a population incapable of being absorbed into the productive system. The concluding essays provide important new data and alternative perspectives on selected topics of the Puerto Rican migration experience. The focus of these essays is the Puerto Rican population in the United States.

Labor migration under capitalism does not represent the latest stage of thinking and research in an ongoing project of the Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños. Refinements in the application of the theoretical framework are gradually evolving as a consequence of wide dissemination and serious reaction to the work. The following abbreviated comments are offered in the spirit of contributing to this ongoing debate.

Central to orthodox historical materialism is the incontrovertible logic of the capitalist laws of motion, although it is theoretically consistent to view these laws as subject to intermittent suspension as a consequence of countervailing forces. I believe the theoretical framework could be enhanced by a systematic discussion of the tendential nature of these laws in the concrete situation of Puerto Rico. Since the historical essays assign significance to the action of the colonial apparatus, the metropolitan state and specific sectors of capital, such a refinement would enhance the logical consistency between both sections of the book.

I see an additional area where the integration of theory and analysis could possibly be enhanced. Insofar as the creation of relative surplus population is an historical tendency, a more precise formulation should examine the relationship between alterations in the composition of the productive forces and their effects on labor reserves during specified historical conjunctures.

The emigration dialectic is a passionate polemic which attempts to employ historical materialist concepts to illuminate the Puerto

Rican migration reality. Maldonado ardently subjects a variety of social issues and methodological approaches to critical evaluation. Although he envisions the implantation of capitalism as the principal force both creating and expelling redundant labor from Puerto Rico, United States strategic geo-political concerns and the compliant actions of a corrupt colonial administration are also important variables shaping the island's destiny. Although it is difficult not to be sympathetic to the concerns expressed in the book, a tendency toward doctrinairism often dilutes its theoretical coherence. The book is replete with important passages from the works of Marx. Unfortunately, the significance of the conceptualizations for appreciating the dialects of migration is declared, rather than demonstrated through rigorous application to the concrete situation.

PEDRO A. CABÁN

Puerto Rican and Latin American Studies Program
Fordham University
Rose Hill, Bronx NY 10458, U.S.A.

Revolution and economic development in Cuba. ARTHUR MACEWAN.
New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981. (Distributed in Europe by
Ffeffer and Simons.) xvi + 265 pp. (Cloth US\$ 22.50, Dfl. 68,65)

The economy of socialist Cuba: a two-decade appraisal. CARMELO MESA-
LAGO. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1981. xvi
+ 235 pp. (Cloth US\$ 17.50, Paper US\$ 9.95)

What happens when serious scholars of divergent views approach the same topic? The result may be a dialogue of the deaf. Sometimes, however, there may be a process akin to triangulation, in which the overlaps and differences can help the reader. These two economic studies of Cuba, a country often treated with more heat than light, achieve such a triangulation. Although no work on a revolution still in process can be definitive, these two books create a framework for analysis. They also present the extant data base on the Cuban economy, from 1959 to the mid-1970s, with the care it deserves.

Carmelo Mesa-Lago, while a critic of Cuban policy, has been open to dialogue with those of other views. He remains critical, especially of what he terms the "Mao-Guevarist" policies of the 1960's, but his criticisms are no mere polemics. Arthur MacEwan, a supporter of the revolution, is also no uncritical propagandist. He does not gloss over the difficulties which Mesa-Lago identifies, although he does interpret them differently. Together, MacEwan and Mesa-Lago present a generally consistent description of what happened in the Cuban economy after the revolution. Their contrasting views on *why* it happened, and how to evaluate the record, form an excellent scholarly dialectic.

Both authors, as economists, are concerned with Cuba's overall growth record. They agree on the main outlines: a burst of growth immediately after the revolution, followed by disruption and decline during the 1960's. They concur that there was a round of impressive growth in the early 1970's, which they attribute only partly to high sugar prices. Both conclude internal changes were important to accelerating growth at the time. They agree that growth slowed but did not cease in the late 1970's, with lower sugar prices at least part of the cause.

Supporter and critic agree, too, that while Cuba became independent of the United States, its economy did not become truly dependent of export price fluctuations and of aid (although they diverge on how much political autonomy and leeway for independent economic policy was gained). Both conclude that economic equality increased markedly, although MacEwan argues for an estimate of income and consumption equalization that Mesa-Lago places at one extreme of the range of possible estimates. (Both authors, in this regard, as on the question of growth, are exemplary in their discussions of assumptions used and the provenance and probable reliability of data.)

The framing of the books, rather than the presentation of the record, shows the differences of the authors' paradigms. Mesa-Lago essays an *evaluation*, appraising the first two decades of revolution on five dimensions: economic growth, diversification of production, external economic independence, full employment and equality in distribution. These criteria are appropriate in a conventional sense, in that they are taken from the stated aims of

the revolution. The author strains to be fair, even when he is clearly at his most critical. While he gives the economy low marks overall, he is clear enough about successes in the area of equality and growth.

MacEwan is more concerned with the *process* by which the revolution found its way to different positions than he is with grading it. In dealing with policies like moral incentives, he considers their reason for adoption as well as their immediate results. For Mesa-Lago, the propensity of the revolution to change course is a possibly unfortunate "given" condition. For MacEwan, it is a sign of vitality: in the long run it may be more important than the speed with which specific economic goals are accomplished. What for Mesa-Lago may be ideological intransigence is for MacEwan explicable as response to real problems faced in trying to achieve political goals of national unity, independence and equality.

Thus MacEwan argues that the adoption of moral incentives was not a "mistake," but a risky but necessary step. In a period of limited resources, individual material incentives could have disrupted solidarity. The later decline of productivity under moral incentives, and the government's 1970 change of course, represent an implicit pressure from the masses (for more attention to current consumption needs and for equality of effort as well as of reward) to which the government responded as if to a plebiscite. Other policies are also interpreted as part of a dialectically evolving system. The differences between MacEwan and Mesa-Lago are thus ones of epistemology and not merely of sympathy. One can learn about social scientific method, as well as about Cuba, by comparing the books.

Naturally, any informed reader will have some disagreements. My own first critique of both books is that neither compares the Cuban experience with that of the rest of the Caribbean basin. Surely a comparison of Cuba's recent record with that of its neighbors would be relevant for evaluating its economic accomplishments and problems. From a political viewpoint, comparison both with countries where U.S. intervention remained high, and with neighbors (e.g., Jamaica) where socialist policies were frustrated in the absence of revolution may be particularly illuminating.

ting. In addition, my one in-depth look at Cuba, on the eve of the 1970 sugar harvest, left me less critical of the ten million ton target than either author (Edel 1970). I believe the harvest's failure was more one of *logistics* than of insufficient work effort. Enough cane was cut so that if milling had been faster, transport better, and yields maintained, the target would have been within reach. Absenteeism from jobs may have been due in part to higher social payoffs for volunteer work rather than to insufficient zeal. But these are matters of detail.

I recommend both books highly.

REFERENCE

EDEL, MATTHEW, 1970. An Experiment in Growth with Social Justice: Thoughts on the 1970 Cuban Harvest. *Economic and Political Weekly* 5: 29-31, Special Number, July.

MATTHEW EDEL

Queens College and the Bildner Center for Western Hemisphere Studies
City University of New York
Flushing NY 11367, U.S.A.

Democracy and clientelism in Jamaica, CARL STONE. New Brunswick NJ and London: Transaction Books, 1980. 262 pp. (Cloth US\$ 16.95, £ 13.00)

Carl Stone sets out to explain the preservation and persistence of competitive democratic politics and to account for electorally determined changes of government in Jamaica. He proposes a clientelistic model of "democratic authoritarianism" (which he suggests is typical of many Third World countries) as being the characteristic and central feature of that country's politics. This pattern, he proposes, emerged against the background of a process of change from a (colonial) paternalistic class system to a competitive one. In this regard, Stone's discussion of Jamaican class structure is excellent, persuasive, and highly relevant to most Third World societies.

Jamaica's two major political parties have distinct ideological preferences and less distinct, though clearly discernible, class ties. The Jamaican Labor Party (JLP), with a politically conservative leadership, had its beginnings in trade union agitation on behalf of the country's lower class workers. The Peoples National Party (PNP) has its roots in middle class nationalist politics led by a middle class intelligentsia schooled in the Fabian socialism of Western Europe. These differences are reflected in the right-center and left-center multi-class coalitions that respectively represent JLP and PNP support bases.

Support for the two major parties in Jamaica, according to Stone, relates (a) to partisanship ties forged from ideological affinity and class affiliations, and (b) to clientelistic ties using the state for patronage resources. While partisanship is a shifting constant (the urban working and lower classes, which are not clearly differentiated conceptually, have exhibited a growing preference for the PNP), it is clientelism that explains the political "swings" that seem to respond to perceptions of the ruling party's economic performance.

Stone's analysis focuses on the support end of the patron-client relationship while ignoring the structure and content of the patronage system. What is expected in exchange for political support? Is the relationship tacit or explicit? Are direct (pork-barrel) or indirect (policy decisions) channels used? Who determines and controls the terms under which political support is granted and withdrawn? How are these decisions communicated?

Problems emerge in the interpretation and analysis of the data. These reflect partly Stone's attempt to represent the political sociology of the country in its total complexity, and partly an obscure presentation of statistical techniques coupled with an inadequate discussion of methodology (both of which, in a few cases, appear questionable). For instance, Stone argues that because of the preeminence of clientelistic ties in the rural areas, where 60 percent of the electorate is located, the rural vote has remained highly competitive. This, he proposes, explains party-political swings and the persistence of competitive electoral politics. It appears from the data, however, that swings in the rural vote may very well result, not from clientelism, but from support

shifts among less than ten percent of the voters in "competitive" constituencies within the context of permanent, strong, and relatively equal partisan support for the two parties. Similarly, his own data and his own analysis suggest massive shifts in the urban vote, especially among the middle classes and ideological center, despite his argument for a highly partisan urban electorate bound mainly to the PNP with some JLP pockets of support. In these and other instances, his data presentation and choice of statistical technique do not eliminate alternative explanations while strengthening opposing interpretations.

Stone recognizes that the primary and paramount impact upon public policy derives from "international currents" but he goes on to ignore, totally, the external variable in his analysis. This is the study's major flaw.

Notwithstanding what is said above, the study makes major and important contributions to the analysis of politics in Third World countries. Stone's adoption of residual analysis in bivariate linear regressions for comparing policies of different political parties in the Third World demands emulation. One has to support strongly his argument that ideology functions more as a mobilizer of internal support and becomes important only in the area of foreign political relations. His model of clientelistic politics and authoritarian democracy is a significant advance in the explanation of the mechanics of elite domination within a competitive electoral system. His discussion of the link between private interests and the state from the standpoint of existing theory is excellent. Finally, his model of the public policy domain, though requiring further elaboration, is exemplary and well worth adoption by analysts of Third World politics.

PERCY C. HINTZEN
Afro-American Studies
University of California
Berkeley CA 94720, U.S.A.

Race and politics in the Bahamas. COLIN A. HUGHES. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981. (Distributed in Europe by Feffer and Simons.) 229 pp. (Cloth US\$ 25.00, Dfl. 76,25)

This book is a history of political transitions in the Bahamas. It focuses on the two decades from the mid-1950s to the mid-1970s, a period that began with the formation of an organized black political party and ended with that party securely (electorally, at least) in power and crossing the threshold of national independence. The author's central theme is that racial division between black and white has been of thoroughgoing importance in Bahamian society and has therefore had an integral bearing on the political structure and process. Unlike the larger Commonwealth Caribbean countries where black political movements have been primarily a struggle against colonialism and class domination, the immediate conflict in the Bahamas has been between an emerging black bourgeoisie and a white elite which is native, not foreign, and which traditionally perpetuated its position through Jim Crow segregation, blatant patronage and corruption, and an uncanny ability to perpetuate (largely through the exploitation of racial stereotypes and fears) the notion that they alone were competent to run the country and to maintain its modest prosperity as a tourist resort and off-shore business center. The book is essentially an account of that powerful machinery and mythology as well as a chronicle of how it was eventually weakened, at least to the extent that a black parliamentary majority could be achieved.

The author was born and raised in the Bahamas, and was briefly active in a political movement which sought to integrate the races. (Like all such efforts, that movement suffered an early demise.) Unfortunately, however, he does not appear to have done any field research in the Bahamas, nor even to have systematized his own experience and reflections. The data are drawn primarily from Bahamian newspapers, making large sections of the book a blow-by-blow report of news stories, editorials, letters to the editor, and so on. This is undoubtedly an important body of data, but in a study of race and politics one looks also for first hand observations of political events, discussions with politicians and

ordinary citizenry, survey data on public perceptions and voter attitudes, etc. Regrettably, in this study all such material is conspicuous by its absence.

There is also a critical lack of comparative material that would enlarge our understanding of the Bahamian situation. While it is true that the Bahamas is a special case relative to most of the Caribbean territories, the issue is not quite that simple. Politically (and otherwise), for example, there are striking comparisons between the Bahamas and Bermuda, but the author makes only the faintest reference in that direction. He also fails to develop any discussion of political conflict between blacks and Asians in countries like Guyana, Trinidad, and Suriname, where partisanship corresponds as closely to race as it does in the Bahamas.

I also found the book disappointing from an analytical standpoint. At the beginning, the author cites M. G. Smith's classification of color concepts, and proposes that "structural color," that is, color identity based on class/status variables such as power, wealth and authority, applies most to the Bahamas, rather than phenotypical or genealogical color. The whole thrust of the book, however, seems opposite: color precedes class in the Bahamas, thus creating the country's distinctive politics of race. Hughes returns to analysis in the closing chapter, but fails to put forth any focused interpretation. Instead, the chapter is an eclectic, almost random, series of references to a variety of political classification schemes and to the work of such disparate figures as the psychoanalyst Ernest Jones, the geographer David Lowenthal, the literary and social critic Kenneth Burke, and the political philosopher Sydney Verba.

These shortcomings notwithstanding, the book is carefully researched, well documented, and objectively written. As such, it is of value to any Bahamian scholar.

FRANK E. MANNING
Dept. of Anthropology
University of Western Ontario
London N6A 5C2, Canada

The West Indies at the crossroads: the search for a viable future. EARL GOODING. Cambridge MA: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1981. xviii + 243 pp. (Cloth US\$ 16.95, Paper US\$ 8.95)

Gooding, an Oxford trained professor of community planning and psychology at Alabama A & M, in essence presents two essays under one cover: an extensively documented account of abortive British colonial federalism efforts in the West Indies, a failure he over-simplistically blames on provincial "islandism"; and an assessment of post-independence public policy in the English-speaking Caribbean, excluding the Bahamas and Belize, with major emphasis on Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago.

A well researched comparative treatment of this subregion is much needed since fifteen years have elapsed following Gordon Lewis' *The Growth of the Modern West Indies*. Gooding makes an attempt to address this need by presenting anew the legacy of inter-island division and discussing the ensuing similarities and contrasts of the intense struggle for survival of these small states. Errors of omission and commission seriously undermine the potential of this volume, however, including Gooding's failure to give more than the most cursory attention to growing authoritarianism and eroding legitimacy in Burnham's Guyana even though he utilizes data from as late as 1980 and 1981, and his disturbing tendency to "predetermine" history by stating that all the Associated States except Montserrat were independent by 1980, or that the joint aluminum smelter projects are alive and well. Also, there are many instances of confused, misspelled, or misidentified individuals — both politicians (Norman and Michael Manley and "Senator Dudley" [Thompson?]) and academics ("Martin S." for S.M. Lipset) —, institutions and sources.

W. MARVIN WILL
Dept. of Political Science
University of Tulsa
Tulsa OK 74104, U.S.A.

Street scenes: Afro-American culture in urban Trinidad. MICHAEL LIEBER. Cambridge MA: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1981. xv + 119 pp. (Cloth US\$ 16.50, Paper US\$ 6.95)

In the summer of 1980 while at the airport in Kingston, Jamaica, I observed a well-known government official carrying what seemed to be a weighty briefcase. A young Rastafarian standing next to me was quick to notice the official and commented to his friend, "Boy if I have that man money and position, I not walking with no load like that; somebody have to carry it for me." On the surface, such a comment might seem unlikely coming from a Rasta or from any poor person whose life style symbolically suggests a rejection of bourgeois values. Yet, embodied in this comment is one of the beguiling ambiguities of the stance taken by the alienated masses in the Caribbean: the apparent rejection of the norms and expectations of the middle and upper classes as symbols of oppression and the frequent, often unintended, expression of a desire to share the privileges, if not the power, characteristic of those they regard as oppressors.

This observation touches directly on what Michael Lieber's book is about: the rejection of "bourgeois adjustment" and its replacement by a culture of "liming" and hustling among young urban Trinidadian men. Based on fieldwork carried out in Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, between 1969 and 1971 (and a visit in 1978-79), Lieber presents a sympathetic depiction of Afro-Trinidadian street life. While in Trinidad he participated in the day-to-day life of a group of primarily Afro-Trinidadians whose social and economic activities revolved mainly around marijuana trading and consumption. These are men who, by different routes and reasons, have come to dismiss a "bourgeois" life-style of sacrifice and "demeaning" toil. Much of the data is presented as vignettes of characters whose network of operation the author describes as radiating from himself as ethnographer.

The author seeks to present the culture or "style" (pp. 111-112) of these men as a form of viable adjustment to a society dominated by a mainstream culture whose "key features" are "arrogance, racism, frivolity, intolerance, domination and greed" (p. 116). In trying to achieve this goal, he self-consciously at-

tempts to avoid the constraints of positivist paradigms which tend to inspire their users to portray social life as an ordered whole, viewing such models as better suited to the natural sciences. "Nature has its secrets", the author states, "but social life has no secrets, merely shapes. Consequently the scientific aim is not discovery, but illumination" (p. x). One might ask whether social life is indeed chaotic or whether we simply fail to discover encompassing an order that is convincing to all. Marx, Durkheim, Lévi-Strauss, and others have all shown different ways in which human beings order their reality in order to manage it. The apparently chaotic nature of the "intricately textured morass" (p. xii) which Lieber finds too "ambiguous" to submit to order, may reflect the limitations of social scientific tools more than the chaos of social life.

But Lieber does not seem particularly interested in a scientific approach to social understanding, for while recognizing the fact that humanistic and scientific viewpoints are often harmonious (p. xiv), he appears to step completely over to the humanistic side of the artificial divide. Eschewing the limitations of a search for order, he opts for the "naturalistic outlook" which "takes the world as it is and seeks to understand its contours by noting how its topography unfolds" (p. x).

Lieber goes beyond illuminating the unfolding drama of urban street life. In a noble attempt to dignify the life-style of Trinidad's street hustlers (in the tradition of scholars such as Valentine 1968, Liebow 1967, and others), he passed judgment on the moral merit of "bourgeois" life-style, as compared to that of street hustlers. Taking cue from Oscar Lewis (1966), Lieber explicitly hierarchizes the "styles" he describes; street culture is morally superior to that of the "bourgeois" sector (Chapter 5). But having assumed the responsibility for passing judgment, he might have taken the next logical step, recognized men and women as the active agents of history, and suggested ways by which the society might relieve itself of a morally inferior but dominant minority.

Street hustlers are not simply victims of capitalist exploitation (p. 85); they have responded to oppression — as all oppressed people have — with "creativity." In fact, Lieber argues that street hustlers were "beginning to link their sentiments to a wider

informative context — they were becoming at least partly ideologized" (p. 45). Herein lies a hint of a politically conscious group making an informed choice. But the ambiguous stance of the Rastafarian at the airport in Kingston finds a context in Trinidad also. For while the author is claiming for his subjects a consciousness of what they are rejecting, a claim that presupposes substantive knowledge of the mechanisms behind their oppression, we find some of his characters participating in activities which indirectly support the very system they reject (Chapter 3: *passim*). In fact, "hustlers often claim to admire the 'big boys' . . . leading entrepreneurs, because these men seem to control their enterprises . . ." (p. 71). Lieber neglects to reflect on the known fact that hustling (including pimping) gradually takes on some of the cut-throat competitive, and ultimately oppressive, aspects of the capitalist market system within which it occurs. The creative efforts of street hustlers deserve the recognition given in this work. However, the limits of their political consciousness must also be taken into account, as well as the constraints implicit in their ambiguous disposition toward that which they are rejecting.

The author concentrated his efforts on the culture of hustling without adequately illuminating the relationship between hustlers and the rest of the society. There is mention of ethnic antagonism, for example, but outside of its attribution to the "proximate interactive basis of urban social relations" (p. 30), there is little explanation of how such relations influence the political economy of hustling. In a socio-cultural, as well as economic, sense, the poor are part of a wider capitalist structure, and the Rastafarian in Kingston seems aware of this in a way that the author is not. It would have been enlightening to know how the forces of a capitalist structure function at the local level to thrust the creative spirit into marginality. In fairness to Lieber, it was not his intention to treat such questions. He observes that in attempting to "illuminate patterns of social relations in a place like Port-of-Spain, there is no system or structure to speak of" (p. 53). Hence the relationship between street hustlers and the rest of the society is portrayed as if defined solely by rejection.

In summary, the book makes a much needed contribution to urban ethnography. It presents a sharp focus on hustling as an

alternative to "bourgeois" adjustment in Port-of-Spain. But the ethnographic lens could have been of a wider angle and greater depth of field. Probably its most serious fault is in the emphasis on the creative dignity of hustling at the expense of adequate treatment of the ambiguous stance of the hustler vis-a-vis the "bourgeois" sector he claims to reject.

REFERENCES

- LEWIS, OSCAR, 1966. The culture of poverty. *Scientific American* 215(4): 19-25.
- LIEBOW, ELIOT, 1967. *Tally's corner: a study of Negro streetcorner men*. Boston, Little, Brown.
- VALENTINE, CHARLES A., 1968. *Culture and poverty*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

TREVOR W. PURCELL
Dept. of Anthropology
Reed College
Portland OR 97202, U.S.A.

Kaiso! the Trinidad calypso. KEITH Q. WARNER. Washington D.C.: Three Continents Press, 1982. xi + 155 pp. (Cloth US\$ 18.00, Paper US\$ 9.00)

As a means of gaining access to the soul of a culture, there is often no better vehicle than its music. And in those societies where a particular musical style or genre splices up nearly all of social life and punctuates nearly all events, the critic or historian or ethnographer is in luck. For unlike many other cultural strata whose artifacts must be painfully distilled from their obscure bedrocks, music announces itself with a strength and clarity which is there for the taking. Certainly this is so in Trinidad where calypso emerges as a clear and vivid reflection of a society's thoughts on itself.

Warner provides an excellent picture of just what those thoughts have been and how they have been expressed through

calypso. He calls his account a study of calypso as oral literature. Certainly calypso is like literature in that it uses language artfully to paint landscapes of shared experience. But we really gain little by viewing music as oral literature. Lyrical music is music. Why try to doll it up by calling it literature, oral or otherwise? Somehow in the minds of High Culture, lyrical folk music sits a few notches below literature as a social achievement. And so the "oral literature" concept comes along to raise it up a little to a higher plateau. But this is a small gripe. Warner knows very well what he has on his hands: a cultural form whose sublime artistry is second to none. He takes this form, looks it over closely, and provides us with a lucid and thorough account of its development. He describes skillfully how calypso has woven its way into the core of Trinidadian national style and, in particular, how it has come to serve as a vehicle for political and moral criticism.

In fact, it is no exaggeration to claim that calypso has come to serve as an expression of Trinidad's conscience. Now, conscience articulated as music can be a very dangerous and explosive thing, as can be seen in the many, many episodes in which powerful and insecure elites have condemned musical forms as "decadent." Certainly such attempts have been made in Trinidad, but it is a tribute to the relative freedom and resilience of that nation that such a critical form has been able to flourish and to sting.

Warner describes this "sting" of calypso thoroughly. We get a good clear picture of the calypsonian as composer and performer, as innovator and prima donna. The book is filled with lyrical excerpts and even with music sheets. There are photographs and illustrations. All these are woven into Warner's account to provide as good an overview of calypso as any available.

MICHAEL LIEBER
348 N. Sycamore Ave.
Los Angeles CA 90036, U.S.A.

Ensayos sobre cultura dominicana. BERNARDO VEGA (ed.). Santo Domingo: Museo del Hombre Dominicano, 1981. 245 pp. (Paper US\$ 8.50)

Dominican historiography traditionally denies that any part of Dominican culture is the result of African influence (p. 16). On the other hand, a certain romanticism, well-intentioned but not very scientific, exaggerates Amerindian influences on contemporary Dominican culture (p. 12). In addition, Dominicans frequently believe that they are fundamentally Spanish in origin and culture, regardless of "the real perception of the race" (p. 63).

From 1979 to 1981, the Museo del Hombre Dominicano commissioned seven researchers in the Dominican Republic to address the nature of Dominican culture in order to help the museum redesign its permanent ethnographic collection. The essays reproduced in this volume, along with a brief introduction by the then-director of the museum, address the nature of Dominican culture today, both by analyzing it and by reflecting it.

A persistent theme throughout the book is the image of Dominican culture held by Dominicans themselves. Gently but firmly the authors argue that popular as well as elite images of Dominican culture have been heavily influenced by romanticism and racial prejudice. Throughout most of the last two centuries, Dominicans have consistently downplayed African influences and have romanticized the contribution of the island's indigenous population to contemporary Dominican culture. Records indicate that the majority of Dominicans identified themselves racially as *indios* already in the nineteenth century, although most had no known Indian ancestry. Historian Moya Pons argues that these prejudices were rooted in the sociopolitical context of the nineteenth century — a negative reaction to Haitian domination in the early part of the century, the resulting association of things African with things Haitian, the growing disappointment with an inefficient and weak Spanish government in the middle of the century, and the ensuing search for a collective national identity independent of the African and the Iberian. In sum, the book characterizes Dominican images of Dominican culture as seriously skewed but historically understandable.

There are signs, however, that the image is changing. Over the past decade, a growing number of intellectuals have begun to focus on the African presence in Dominican culture. They have held seminars and conferences, and have invited noted foreign Afro-Americanists to participate. This book is clearly a product of that intellectual discourse. First, it is a statement by a select group of Dominicans of the need to bring the popular image closer to the historical and social reality of the country. Second, it appears to be a response to the more extreme picture painted by a segment of the Dominican intelligentsia. Carlos Deive, who in this volume explores the African legacy in contemporary Dominican culture and whom one would expect to be more sympathetic to the stronger Africanist argument, argues that many of its proponents are extremists, anti-colonialists, and dogmatic Marxists.

By contrast, this volume breaks only partially with the traditional scholarship and the popular image it decries. There are clearly two parts to this book. The first four entries by Bernardo Vega, Marcio Veloz Maggiolo (comments on Vega), Carlos Dobal and Carlos Deive explore the indigenous, Spanish and African contributions respectively to Dominican culture. The order itself reflects the image the volume criticizes. Vega's essay on the indigenous heritage is a description of material culture, departing only in minor parts from traditional discussions on the first inhabitants of the Caribbean. It is also the longest essay, if one counts the 39 photographs that accompany it. Dobal's piece on the Spanish legacy is detailed elite history followed by broad assertions about the psychological legacy of the Spanish in the Dominican Republic. The articles that follow, however, are more process-oriented and offer integrated social, institutional, and economic analyses.

At least half of Deive's essay concerns the analytic problem of identifying the "African," the Spanish, or the indigenous in contemporary cultures in the Americas. Ruben Silié focuses on the way in which size and organization of farms and cattle-raising helped shape the rise of a Creole culture. José del Castillo analyzes the contribution of immigrants to the Dominican Republic in the past hundred years in terms of the social class or occupational sector which they entered. And Moya Pons reviews the technolo-

gical and social changes of this century, concluding that they have affected national self-perception. Moya Pons' comments on collective self-perception are wide-ranging and insightful. By arguing that the recent massive migration of Dominicans to the U.S. has led Dominicans to deal with other peoples' perception of their racial identity, Moya Pons comments, albeit indirectly, on the rise of the Africanist image in current Dominican intellectual circles. Thus, he captures the thrust of the book: that there is a popular image that needs to be debunked but that there is also a danger that in the zeal to debunk it, an equally one-sided image may come to take its place.

VIRGINIA R. DOMÍNGUEZ
Dept. of Anthropology
Duke University
Durham NC 27706, U.S.A.

Los Estados Unidos y Trujillo: colección de documentos del Departamento de Estado y de las Fuerzas Armadas Norteamericanas. BERNARDO VEGA (ed.). Santo Domingo: Fundación Cultural Dominicana, 1982. *Año 1945* – 352 pp.; *Año 1946* (2 vols.) – 507 + 171 pp. (Paper, n.p.)

These volumes are the first of a planned Series in which documents from the archives of the United States' Departments of State and Defense are to be collected. The documents are of importance for our understanding of the political relations between the Dominican Republic and the United States during, approximately, the last three decades of the Trujillo régime which ended in 1961.

The editor did not take his task lightly. Not only was he in charge of collecting, selecting and translating the documents, and critically editing them where the need arose, but he also wrote an Introduction for the Series as a whole and one for each volume. He further wrote a number of highly useful essays providing the background against which the documents should be viewed. Among the themes covered are: the foundations of U.S. policy vis-

à-vis Trujillo; U.S. policy toward Latin America in 1946; the *rapprochement* between Trujillo and the Dominican communist groups in the post-war years; Trujillo's lobbyists in the United States; and his arms deal with Brazil. The Dominican dictator's scheming against Betancourt (Venezuela) and Grau (Cuba) is reflected in a number of intriguing documents. The second volume for the year 1946 is dedicated to an FBI report on Dominican communism and to a State Department analysis of Trujillo's régime between 1930 and 1946. The volumes further contain a chronology of events, indexes of documents and names, and lists of the main personalities involved, some of them with biographies and photographs.

These first volumes augur well for the success of this impressive undertaking. The documents contain much new factual material. Moreover, many of them provide revealing glimpses of the processes by which U.S. policy-makers molded the images they cultivated of Latin Americans in general and Dominicans in particular: how they were expected to behave and react, and how they should be dealt with. There was not one monolithic image; there were many, and their diversity led to constant bickering between different U.S. governmental sectors. Such divergences in interests and viewpoints were, in turn, slyly and at times cruelly exploited by Trujillo and his servants.

Bernardo Vega is an admirably versatile scholar. An economist by formal training, he also is an accomplished archaeologist. His new venture into the field of history, undertaken with professional self-assurance, should be warmly welcomed. The publisher of the Series is a Foundation headed by the author, at whose address (Apartado 1265, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic) copies may be requested.

H. HOETINK
Center for Caribbean Studies
University of Utrecht
3508 TC Utrecht, Netherlands

Voces del purgatorio: estudio de la salve dominicana. MARTHA ELLEN DAVIS. Santo Domingo: Museo del Hombre Dominicano, Investigaciones Antropológicas No. 15, 1981. xv + 106 pp. (Paper US\$ 4.00)

Dr. Davis has spent many years in the Dominican Republic as a field researcher/teacher and continues to provide valuable documentation of Dominican traditions. This small but interesting volume comes from the on-going work that she began while researching religious brotherhoods for her doctoral dissertation. Her work received honorable mention in 1976 from the committee of the Chicago Folklore Prize and is soon to be published in Spanish by the Museo del Hombre Dominicano.

In the introduction, the author presents the reader with the concept of the Dominican Republic as a mulatto society. The mixture of Spanish and African musical traditions, as displayed in the *salve*, is her theme. She says, "this work deals with a fundamental religious genre very characteristic of the mulatto community: *la velación*, and in particular, the indispensable musical ingredient of the *velación*, *la salve*."

The *salve*, as a musical genre, originally consisted of musical versions of the text of the Catholic prayer Salve Regina, and was "generally related to the rosary." In the Dominican Republic, the *salve* has developed two stylistic extremes, one highly sacred and the other secular within a religious context. The unity of styles is based on the text, called the *Salve de la Virgen* and the social context in which it is performed, principally before the altar during *velaciones*.

Voices from purgatory: study of the Dominican 'salve' is organized into six short chapters: (1) introduction; (2) spectrum of the *salve* (discussion of the sacred *salve* as musically and textually hispanic and the secular *salve* as representative of Afroamerican hybridization); (3) contexts of the *salve* (description of the *velación*, a patronal feast in honor of a personal patron saint which is performed in the home of one who wishes to fulfill a promise); (4) the structural unity between the *salve* and the *velación* (musical and textual aspects of the sacred and secular *salve* and the important use of repetition); (5) intensification in the *salve* and the *velación*

(emotional states of participants in the *velación* — performance without climax, "subido," and with climax, "ritual possession"); and (6) conclusions: the *velación* and *salve* illustrate incomplete syncretism; although there is a fusion of some elements from both African and Hispanic cultures, there remains a "coexistence within a single type of ritual or musical genre of two distinct musical traditions." The social function of the *salve* and its growing secularization complete this section.

Within the discussion of the Dominican *salve*, Davis presents ample documentation from various regions of the country and related traditions in Puerto Rico and Haiti. Her work is important partially because it concentrates on the secular form of *salve* and therefore describes in detail a major Afro-Hispanic musical performance style in the Dominican Republic. She also discusses its relative importance in relationship to the more famous *merengue*. Students of Afro-Caribbean cultures, however, might hope that the small section devoted to increased secularization and urban influences will be the theme of future publications by this author. The discussion of emotional states and possession among participants is interesting but may not do justice to such a complex and still little understood psychological phenomenon. Five musical transcriptions provide the reader with some idea of salient musical characteristics and are accompanied by short informative explanations of style.

This is an important addition to the literature on Afro-Caribbean societies and needs to appear in English, as should others of the author's publications.

RONALD R. SMITH
Folklore Institute
Indiana University
Bloomington IN 47405, U.S.A.

Los Negros Caribes de Honduras, RUY GALVAO DE ANDRADE COELHO. Translated from the English by GUADALUPE CARIAS ZAPATA. Tegucigalpa, Honduras: Editorial Guaymuras, 1981. 208 pp. (Paper n.p.)

Only on the back cover of this modest little book is the reader told that it was originally written in English, but nowhere is it stated that this is the first time it has ever been generally available in any language. The English version has thus far been read only by scholars who seek it out at Northwestern University, where it reposes as a doctoral dissertation finished in 1955. Now the people of Honduras themselves, and especially the Black Carib or Garifuna, as they prefer to be called, may read what has become a minor classic of its kind.

In 1955 few had ever heard of the Black Carib. True, Douglas Taylor's *The Black Carib of British Honduras* (1951) had appeared in the Wenner-Gren (Viking) Series, and there had been a few articles in scholarly journals. But none of these had come to my attention as a graduate student and it was only by chance that I discovered their existence on a 1955 summer field trip to Guatemala. Soon after, Coelho's work was mentioned to me by his former professor, Melville Herskovits, and I found it extremely valuable as a balance to Taylor's work. The tables of contents of the two books are remarkably similar, and one wonders whether the choice of subject matter reflects the fashion of the times or the influence of their common mentor.

The first chapter outlines what was then known of Carib history, dividing it into three periods between 1492 and the present. Only secondary sources were used, and the picture presented is considerably out of date today, for there has been a great deal of new material discovered — especially for the most recent period after the deportation of the Black Carib from the island of St. Vincent in 1797.

The data presented on social and economic organization are invaluable for comparative purposes, and amazingly, sound quite contemporary. Coelho notes, for example, that there were already many Caribs in New York City, where they had their own club (p. 41). He also pays considerable attention to matters such as nu-

trition, providing summary dietary information which can be compared with more recent studies.

Finally, there is a description of the indigenous religious system which is useful not only for comparisons through time, but also as a means of determining whether or in what ways the Caribs of Belize had diverged from their brethren in Honduras by the middle of the 20th century. In fact, the similarities are remarkable, and have been explained by the frequent traveling from place to place over the past two centuries. The differences have been less noted, but are equally deserving of analysis. Perhaps the new availability of this material will lead to such a work.

It is perhaps not fair to use modern standards to criticize a work nearly 30 years old. However, because this edition is presented without a new foreword it is likely to be read by many, especially those in Honduras, as though it were a contemporary work. Therefore, it is important to point out just how far anthropology generally, and Carib studies especially, have advanced. The book is bereft of meaningful quantitative data of any sort. This was not uncommon in the fifties, when the detailed description of a "way of life" or a "configuration" of culture patterns was an accepted way of contributing to our knowledge. Furthermore, when there were so many cultures, like that of the Black Caribs, which were virtually unknown to science, this procedure was quite justifiable. It provided a baseline and suggested areas for further research, some of which required new methodologies altogether.

Research on the Black Carib has been booming over the past decade. North American, Italian, British and French anthropologists have all become involved, as have a very few Central Americans, and at least one Garifuna has obtained a Ph.D. in the field. There is increasing awareness on the part of the people themselves, both those who have migrated to work in the cities of North America and England, and those who have remained at home, of the importance of retaining their cultural heritage. Throughout their history, they have continually incorporated innovations into their cultural mainstream, while at the same time preserving the idea of their uniqueness as a people. The publica-

tion of Coelho's book should serve both scholars and the people themselves, though in different ways.

NANCIE L. GONZÁLEZ
Dept. of Anthropology
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742, U.S.A.

Ma Ngombe: guerreros y ganaderos en Palenque. NINA S. DE FRIEDEMANN and RICHARD CROSS. Bogotá: Carlos Valencia Editores, 1979. (Cloth US\$ 32.00)

The research started by Nina de Friedemann in 1974, which resulted in the book discussed here, concerns the inhabitants of a Colombian Negro community located to the south of Cartagena, centered around a village of barely 3000 inhabitants, descendants of one of the first groups of Maroons in South America. The name of the village, Palenque de San-Basilio, indicates its historical origins: *Palenque* is one of the Spanish terms for the reinforced settlements of groups of escaped slaves who — for widely varying periods of time — were able to survive in inhospitable regions and resist the regular pursuit of colonists and the military. When successful, such a Maroon community was able to develop in a more or less isolated and self-sufficient way. De Friedemann's study follows the history of the Maroon community in Colombia through to the present day. She succeeds in creating a flowing and fascinating whole. Her book, encompassing both history and anthropology, demonstrates how essential it is to involve the role and influence of the past in a study of the contemporary social structure of such a community.

"King" Domingo Benkos-Bioho, the legendary hero and first fighter and leader of the Palenqueros, who came from Guinée-Bissau, entered the hinterland in about 1600 with a group of Maroons and, with the help of a well disciplined guerilla group, forced the planters' colony to lengthy and costly pursuit patrols. This, together with the attacks on the plantations by the Maroons themselves, forced the colonists to offer peace to their elusive

opponents and — the most important concession — freedom from slavery. This type of development is typical for the few Maroon groups which were able to stand fast. Others collapsed after varying periods of time.

De Friedemann analyzes the way in which the inhabitants of Palenque de San-Basilio relate the history of their people and leaders to their current existence. The facts, dates, names and places are blurred, but the essence of that early history plays a role in the conception of the "modern" history of the last century as far as genealogy, geography and socio-political structure are concerned.

Despite its clearly demonstrably traditional foundations, the community of Palenque de San-Basilio has undergone a process of integration with the colonial society. Just as in most Latin American areas, Catholicism has played an important part. The traditional religion seems to be able to take over and reshape the Catholic religion easily.

Although the adherence to colonial structures of authority has also been of influence, the traditional ancestral and age-group structures have not been lost, and these play a role in many functions of daily life: in agriculture, in cattle raising, in marriage and in death rituals.

De Friedemann's analysis of the role of rivalry and conflict in the community is interesting. She traces the ritualized form of the manner of rivalry and fighting — with the production of two world-champion boxers as a crowning glory — back to the times of the very real, far from ritualized, struggle for freedom.

She also provides us with an enlightening and human view of the way she, as an outsider and researcher, approached the Palenqueros and how she was regarded by them. Her introduction offers an amusing example of cultural confusion: a colleague from the University of Cartagena, who himself came from San-Basilio and was the son of the village chief, introduced her to his family as his "compañera". He and Nina meant: "colleague", but, as she noticed later, everyone had understood it to mean "second wife". It gave her a definite status in the community: acknowledged and protected. However, because of this it took her some time to regain her independence and freedom of movement. Her feelings of

sympathy and empathy and her attempt to portray the community she writes about in the terms of its own self-perception, without resorting to romance or anecdote, make this book a valuable and most readable contribution to the knowledge of the history and social structure of a Maroon community in America.

The book is richly illustrated with beautiful photographs by Richard Cross. He brings to life both the traditional aspects of the Palenque world and the effects of outside influences which de Friedemann describes for us. He shares her understanding of the people and their surroundings, and her concern for them. There is an ideal partnership which has produced a very beautiful book of high quality.

Finally, I missed two things: maps of the geographical situation, and explanatory texts for some of the photographs.

SILVIA W. de GROOT
Brouwersgracht 204C
1013 HD Amsterdam, Netherlands

Las sociedades arcaicas de Santo Domingo. MARCIO VELOZ MAGGIOLO. Santo Domingo: Museo del Hombre Dominicano, Serie Investigaciones Antropológicas No. 16; Fundación García Arévalo, Serie Investigaciones No. 12, 1980. 100 pp. (Paper US\$ 3.50)

Los modos de vida Meillacoides y sus posibles orígenes (un estudio interpretativo). MARCIO VELOZ MAGGIOLO, ELPIDIO ORTEGA, ANGEL CABÁ FUENTES. Santo Domingo: Museo del Hombre Dominicano, 1981. 433 pp. (Paper US\$ 15.00)

Las sociedades arcaicas summarizes our knowledge about the pre-ceramic inhabitants of the Dominican Republic. The author divides them into two major population groups, Barreroid or Mordanoid (also known as Casimiroid) and Banwaroid, each with a different culture (*esquema*).

The Barreroid people is characterized by chipped flint tools. It lived in small bands on rocky cliffs or sandy beaches, hunting and

gathering the wildlife available there. Veloz Maggiolo dates its entry into Santo Domingo ca. 2600 B.C. and suggests that it came either from South or Central America. He could have been more specific; the Barreroid flintwork resembles that in Central rather than South America (Cruxent and Rouse 1969). In Belize, its development has been traced back to ca. 7500 B.C. by MacNeish *et al.* (1980) and in Cuba, to 3190 B.C. by Kozłowski (1978: 66).

The Banwaroid people is distinguished by ground stone tools. Its bands lived near mangrove swamps so as to exploit their resources, foraged in the forests, and also utilized sea mammals and deep-water fish. Veloz Maggiolo concludes that it migrated from Trinidad to Santo Domingo ca. 2100 B.C. The little known about preceramic remains in the intervening islands supports his conclusion.

About 2000 B.C., according to him, the two peoples came into contact and "hybridized," by which he means that they exchanged customs. Pottery shows up in three sites around 400 B.C., and he attributes this, too, to outside contact. The possibility that some innovations may have been due to internal development is not considered.

Previous authors had identified the two Archaic peoples solely in terms of their artifactual complexes. Thanks to the establishment of a Laboratorio de Ciencias Naturales in the Museo del Hombre Dominicano, Veloz Maggiolo has also been able to utilize the peoples' ecological adaptations, as noted above, on the assumption that its diagnostic complex and adaptations form an organic whole. He overlooks the possibility that its various bands may have adapted differently to local conditions or have practiced seasonal rounds, using and depositing different tool kits in the sites where they performed different activities (Kozłowski 1978).

Las modas de vida Meillacóide y sus posibles orígenes reports on excavations at Ríos Joba and Verde, two stratified sites in the northwestern part of the Dominican Republic. In the lower component of each site, the authors found Ostionoid pottery, characterized by red paint and simple modeling, and in the upper component, Meillacoid pottery, marked by elaborate incised and appliquéd designs. This confirms our previous assumption that

Ostionoid pottery preceded Meillacoid in the northwestern part of the Dominican Republic and in northern Haiti.

The people who made Ostionoid pottery is generally believed to have developed in Puerto Rico and easternmost Santo Domingo and to have expanded westward into Haiti and Jamaica, introducing agriculture and village society (Rouse 1982). The authors hypothesize that the Meillacoid people is also the result of a migration, from Guyana on the South American mainland. They acknowledge that the known occurrences of the supposedly ancestral pottery are too late for such a migration, and offer no evidence of its passage through the intervening regions. They do note that Meillacoid pottery has earlier radiocarbon dates in the Dominican Republic than in Haiti, but this only indicates local movement, like that of the Ostionoid people.

Again, Veloz Maggiolo overlooks the possibility of internal development. He and his co-authors note that Ostionoid and Meillacoid vessels are alike in material and shape, but do not consider this to be evidence of continuity. Nor can they conceive of innovations along the continuity. They reject my previous suggestion that the Meillacoid potters may have copied the designs incised on stone vessels by Archaic craftsmen, arguing that a people does not borrow from less developed peoples — this despite our own adoption of Indian crops, artifact types, and the words for them. Meillacoid appliquéd work is in my opinion also likely to have been a local development, although I would not rule out the possibility that it was transmitted by trade or another kind of interaction along part or all of the route from Guyana.

The authors are more successful in reconstructing the way of life of the Meillacoid people. Avoiding the organic fallacy of the Archaic volume, they note that the inhabitants of the two sites under study made similar pottery but adapted differently to their environments. At Río Joba, near the shore, they relied more on sea food while at Río Verde, which is inland on a fertile flood plain, they developed a more productive form of agriculture. These differences are documented in detail.

Together, the two volumes offer important insights into the manner in which successive peoples exploited Dominican resources. They show, for example, that the *guáyiga* root (*Zamia*

debilis) was gathered and eaten during preceramic and ceramic times as well as today. We need more such studies, using preceramic complexes and ceramic styles as a base line along which to trace continuities and changes in adaptation to local environments.

REFERENCES

- CRUXENT, JOSÉ M. & IRVING ROUSE, 1969. Early man in the West Indies. *Scientific American* 221: 42-52.
- KOZŁOWSKI, JANUSZ K., 1978. In search of the evolution pattern of the preceramic cultures of the Caribbean. *Boletín del Museo del Hombre Dominicano* 13: 61-79.
- MACNEISH, RICHARD S., S. JEFFREY K. WILKERSON & ANTOINETTE NELKEN-TURNER, 1980. *First Annual Report of the Belize Archaic Archaeological Reconnaissance*. Andover, Phillips Academy.
- ROUSE, IRVING, 1982. Ceramic and religious development in the Greater Antilles. *Journal of New World Archaeology* 5 (2): 45-55.

IRVING ROUSE
Department of Anthropology
Yale University
New Haven CT 06520, U.S.A.

De precolumbiaanse bewoners van Aruba, Curaçao en Bonaire. E. H. J. BOERSTRA. Zutphen: De Walburg Pers, 1982. xl + 79 pp. (Paper Dfl. 18.50)

Boerstra discusses in this booklet the prehistoric population of the Dutch Leeward Antilles. Results and findings of archaeological excavations, mainly from 4 Dabajuro sites dated c. 1000 AD in Aruba, are the basis for this discussion. The author is successful in integrating general archaeological information and the Antillean finds. The illustrations are well-chosen to make the subject understandable to a wide public. The publication of this booklet coincides more or less with the opening of the Archaeological Museum at Aruba, where all illustrated objects are exhibited.

The professional encounters a difficult task when writing for a

public without any substantial knowledge of the covered field. The first difficulty is explaining everything in such a way that it becomes fully understandable to the layman. Boerstra's performance in this respect is admirable. The second difficulty is avoiding oversimplifications. The booklet is less successful in this. Little is said on the sites at Curaçao and Bonaire, except that they include Dabajuro pottery. Possible differences in subsistence base and function of the sites are not discussed; the Curaçao sites especially, situated in a different environment, may have had a different function. The reader will reach the conclusion that all Dabajuro sites are equal and synchronous and that they had the same function on all three islands, thereby overlooking possible inter-insular and intra-insular differences.

Many readers will finish this booklet with the impression that Dabajuro is the only group which inhabited the Dutch Leeward Antilles in prehistory, for nothing is said of other groups. A table indicating the main groups which inhabited these islands and their approximate dating would have solved this problem.

No maps are included in the booklet and the text is vague about the topography of the discussed sites. This presentation leaves the reader in the dark about the geographical relationship of the sites and their locations with respect to the (windward or leeward) coast. Further the omission of a bibliography is to be regretted, as this booklet will serve as an introduction to the prehistory of these islands for many readers. The booklet does not give helpful suggestions for further reading.

In spite of these criticisms, this booklet is a must for anyone interested in the prehistory of the region and will be interesting reading to a very wide public. It is a pity that it is only available in Dutch at present. In view of the few existing publications on the prehistory of the Dutch Antilles, it fills a gap.

A. H. VERSTEEG
Institute of Prehistory
University of Leiden
2300 RA Leiden, Netherlands

Isle de France Creole: affinities and origins. PHILIP BAKER and CHRIS CORNE. Ann Arbor MI: Karoma Publishers, 1982. viii + 299 pp. (Cloth US\$ 23.50, Paper US\$ 15.50)

The societies of the Caribbean and those of the western Indian Ocean share parallel histories and exhibit remarkable sociocultural similarities. This fact and its implications have been little recognized, much less explored, in the theoretical writings of social scientists concerned with societies heir to the African Diaspora. Once it is realized that every single feature taken to underlie Caribbean regional commonality (see, for example, Mintz 1966), except of course for geographical propinquity, is also present in the Mascarenes (Mauritius, Réunion and Rodrigues) and the Seychelles, the Americo-centric bias in studies of the diaspora is evident.

An exception to this bias has always been the work of linguists who focus on French creoles. In fact, attempts to explain the apparent unity of American French creoles with those of the Indian Ocean have stimulated some of the most important work in the origins and genesis of French creoles, and in the process of language creolization itself. *Isle de France Creole* belongs in this tradition, but also begins to transcend the disciplinary boundaries between the study of language and other historical and sociocultural processes. This book presents a synchronic comparison of the four Indian Ocean French creoles and the American French creoles; however, it goes one step further in analysing their affinities and dissimilarities diachronically, so as to begin to explain the socio-linguistic forces behind them. It is this latter concern that should provoke the interest of all Caribbeanists, whether linguists or not.

“*Isle de France*,” of course, refers to Mauritius before the British takeover in 1812. Until that point all of the islands of the western Indian Ocean were controlled and settled by the French — from 1721 in Mauritius, 1663 in Réunion (called “Bourbon” in the 17th and early 18th century), 1770 in the Seychelles and 1792 in Rodrigues. Réunion alone remained French after the Treaty of Paris in 1814, but distinct French creoles continued to be spoken on all of the islands.

The relationship among the four Indian Ocean creoles themselves has always been problematic, primarily because each creole remained relatively unstudied. Although Mauritian Creole (MC) was described as early as 1880 (Baissac 1880), Réunion Creole (RC) was analysed extensively only in 1974 with the publication of Chaudenson's *Le lexique du parler créole de la Réunion*. In this work not only was RC thoroughly described for the first time, but it was also proposed that "Bourbonnais" (RC in the 17th and early 18th centuries) was the original creole spoken in the Indian Ocean and was spread from Réunion to the other islands by Réunionais settlers. From this premise, Chaudenson claims that the four creoles of the Indian Ocean are typologically similar and belong to the same linguistic tradition. Finally, Chaudenson attributes the similarities among American French creoles and the Indian Ocean ones to the common provincial origins of the French colonists in both areas.

Isle de France Creole is an extended refutation, in two essays, of Chaudenson's historical and comparative analyses. In Part A, using Chaudenson's own linguistic data for RC, Corne shows the basic dissimilarities of the predicate systems and of a number of syntactic processes and their semantic motivations between MC and RC, and concludes that RC and MC are not directly related typologically. He goes on to point out the structural similarities and semantic affinities between MC and American French creoles, while suggesting that RC might be better viewed as a dialect of French.

In Part B, Baker examines in great detail the historical evidence on Mauritian settlement in the period 1721 to 1735, the crucial period for MC formation. Based on the historical data, he shows convincingly that there was virtually no Réunionais contribution to the permanent settlement of Mauritius, contrary to one of Chaudenson's premises. Examining a number of grammatical items, Baker goes on to demonstrate the genetic relationships among MC, Rodriguais Creole and Seychellois Creole, and their distinctiveness vis-a-vis RC. Further, these same grammatical items, not attested to in RC, are found in the American French creoles, especially Haitian Creole (HC).

Baker's conclusions, based on different evidence, are the same

as Corne's, but Baker goes on to discuss the probable historical and sociolinguistic factors accounting for the affinities between MC and HC, and their dissimilarities with RC. The most important factor is the different settlement histories: "Réunion differed from the others in two significant respects: the proportion of first language speakers of French was considerably higher in Réunion than in Mauritius or Haiti, while the latter two were populated [through slave importations] at a much faster rate than Réunion" (p. 259). The slave population of Réunion, in fact, only surpassed the free, French-speaking population fifty years after its initial settlement. Furthermore, in the period 1730–1735, Baker demonstrates *West* Africans accounted for the majority of the slave population in Mauritius. Thus, both Mauritius and Haiti were influenced by the same African languages (especially Fon, Wolof and the Mande group) at a critical juncture in the creolization process, whereas Réunion was not. Finally, appealing to Bickerton's (1977) theory that the "expansion" of pidgin into creole follows innate rules of children's language acquisition, Baker accounts for the subsequent parallel development of MC and HC. RC, probably not a true creole at all, shows no evidence of a prior pidgin base. Baker does not pretend that his argument is conclusive, but he does provide more promising avenues of exploration than any previous treatments of this problem.

This book is well worth reading for any one interested in the development of Creole societies and cultures. While it may occasionally strike the non-linguist as narrowly restricted in focus, and even polemical in tone, the implications of this comparison of French creoles and settlement histories among islands so distant geographically and yet so close socio-historically are far-reaching. Careful attention to these intriguing Indian Ocean societies can only enrich our historical, anthropological and sociological understanding of the African Diaspora.

REFERENCES

- BAISSAC, CHARLES, 1880. *Etude sur le patois créole mauricien*. Nancy, Imprimerie Berger-Levrault.
- BICKERTON, DEREK, 1977. Pidginization and creolization: language acquisition

and language universals. In ALBERT VALDMAN (ed.), *Pidgin and creole linguistics*, Bloomington and London, Indiana University Press, pp. 49–69.

CHAUDENSON, ROBERT, 1974. *Le lexique du parler créole de la Réunion*. Paris, Champion.

MINTZ, SIDNEY W., 1966. The Caribbean as a socio-cultural area. *Journal of World History* IX(4): 912–937.

ALEXIS M. GARDELLA

Carter G. Woodson Institute for Afro-American and African Studies

University of Virginia

Charlottesville VA 22903, U.S.A.

and

Dept. of Social Anthropology

London School of Economics

London WC2A 2AE, England